THE
JAINA SOURCES
OF THE
HISTORY OF ANCIENT INDIA

THE

JAINA SOURCES

OF THE

HISTORY OF ANCIENT INDIA

(100 B.C.—A.D. 900)

by

JYOTI PRASAD JAIN
M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.

MUNSHI RAM MANOHAR LAL
ORIENTAL BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS
Post Box 1165, Nai Sarak, Delhi-6

FIRST EDITION : 1964

RUPEES TWENTY

PUBLISHED BY M. L. JAIN, PROPRIETOR, M/S. MUNSHI RAM MANOHAR LAL, DELHI, AND PRINTED BY J. K. SHARMA AT THE ALLAHABAD LAW JOURNAL PRESS, 5 PRAYAG STREET, ALLAHABAD.

TO

THE LOVING MEMORY OF MY FATHER

SRI PARAS DAS JAIN (*d. 4 Sept., 1956*)

PREFACE

THE PRESENT volume consists of my studies spread over a period of about two decades in the Jaina sources of the history of ancient India (*circa* 100 B.C. to A.D. 900) and presents a brief survey of the more important of these sources, particularly literary ones, and a discussion of certain fundamental problems such as the dates of Mahāvīra and of the beginning of the Earlier Śaka, Vikrama, and Śaka eras. It was originally submitted as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the Agra University.

These studies, though by their very nature are apparently detached, have been interlinked and chronologically arranged. Some necessary emendations and alterations in the scheme of contents have also been subsequently made.

The appreciation of the work by the learned examiners and other scholar-friends has encouraged me to get the work published. When the question of choosing the right type of publishers posed before me, my friend, Prof. K. D. Bajpai of Saugor University came to my rescue and introduced me to Messrs. Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, Oriental Publishers, Delhi, who readily undertook the publication of the work. I am glad that they have made it see the light of the day and in such a presentable form, too.

It is a great pleasure to me to be able to express my heartfelt gratitude to my respected teacher, Dr. B. R. Chatterji, and to the late Dr. R. S. Tripathi for their valuable suggestions. Sri Manohar Lal Jain,

the proprietor of the publishing firm, also deserves my thanks. My sons, Shashi Kant and Rama Kant, have helped me in preparing the press-copy and checking the final proofs.

15 *November* 1963.
'Jyoti Nikunj',
Charbagh,
Lucknow.

JYOTI PRASAD JAIN

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	—*Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.*
A.I.O.C.	—All India Oriental Conference.
ASI	—*Archaeological Survey of India.*
BG	—*Bombay Gazetteer.*
B.G.P.	—Bharatiya Gyānpītha, Kāśī (Varanasi).
B.O.R I.	—Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
CHI	—*Cambridge History of India.*
C.J.O.L.	—Central Jaina Oriental Library, Arrah.
EC	—*Epigraphia Carnatica.*
EI	—*Epigraphia Indica.*
E.S.E.	—Earlier Śaka Era.
G.E.	—Gupta Era.
IA	—*Indian Antiquary.*
IHQ	—*Indian Historical Quarterly.*
JA	—*Jaina Antiquary*, Arrah.
JBBRAS	—*Journal of Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society.*
JBHS	—*Journal of Bombay Historical Society.*
JBRAS	—*Journal of Bengal Royal Asiatic Society.*
JBORS	—*Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society.*
JBU	—*Journal of Bombay University.*
J.C.R.S.	—Jaina Cultural Research Society, Banaras.
JG	—*Jaina Gazette*, English Monthly, Lucknow.
JRAS	—*Journal of Royal Asiatic Society.*
JSB	—*Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, Arrah.
JSI	—*Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, N. R. Premi, Bombay.
JSS	—*Jaina Sāhitya Saṁśodhaka*, Ahmedabad.

MAR —*Mysore Archaeological Report.*
M.D.J.G. —Manikchand Digambara Jaina Granthamālā, Bombay.
M.E. —Mahāvīra Era.
MER —*Madras Epigraphical Report.*
MJ —*Mediaeval Jainism*, by B. A. Saletore.
Mod. Rev. —*Modern Review*, Calcutta.
My. & Cg. —*Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions*, by L. Rice.
NKC —*Nyāyakumudacandra*, M.D.J.G., Bombay edition.
PHAI —*Political History of Ancient India*, H. C. Raychaudhury.
PIHC —*Proceedings of Indian History Congress.*
PJVS —*Purātana Jaina Vākya Sūcī*, Sarsawa.
R.J.S. —Raichandra Jaina Śāstramālā, Bombay.
RTT —*Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times*, by A. S. Altekar.
SBE —*Sacred Books of the East* Series.
SBJ —*Sacred Books of the Jainas* Series.
S.E. —Śaka Era.
S.J.G. —Singhi Jaina Granthamālā, Bombay.
SSIJ —*Studies in South Indian Jainism*, by M.S. Ramaswami Ayyangar.
TP —*Tiloyapaṇṇati* of Yativṛṣabha.
V.E. —Vikrama Era.
V.S.M. —Vīra Sewā Mandir, Sarsawa—Delhi.
ZDMG —*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesselschaft*

SCHEME OF TRANSLITERATION

अ—a आ—ā इ—i ई—ī उ—u ऊ—ū

ऋ—ṛ ए—e ऐ—ai ओ—o औ—au

अं—ṁ अः—ḥ

क—ka ख—kha ग—ga घ—gha ङ—ṅa

च—ca छ—cha ज—ja झ—jha ञ—ña

ट—ṭa ठ—tha ड—ḍa ढ—ḍha ण—ṇa

त—ta थ—tha द—da ध—dha न—na

प—pa फ—pha ब—ba भ—bha म—ma

य—ya र—ra ल—la व—va

श—śa ष—ṣa स—sa ह—ha

क्ष—kṣa त्र—tra ज्ञ—jña

INTRODUCTION

JINASENA, the well-known Jaina Purāṇakāra, defines history in the most general terms as an account of past happenings, which must be authoritative, truthful and righteous.[1] But he does not necessarily mean this 'record of the past' to be a mere chronicle of events. As the Greek historian Polybius observed, "If you take from history all explanation of cause, principle and motive, and of the adaptation of the means to the end, what is left is a mere panorama without being instructive, and though it may please for the moment, it has no abiding value." Ancient Indian savants like Kauṭilya and Jinasena had a broad and ultramodern conception of history. By their use of the term 'Dharmaśāstra' for history they introduced the cultural beside the material factors as essential constituents of historical concept.

To serve its true purpose, therefore, history cannot depend on only one set or one type of sources, but it has to make the best use of all the available material which may have been contributed by different sections of the people the life of which it aims to depict.

The Jaina community, with its unique cultural

[1] इतिहास इतीष्ट तद् इतिहासीदिति श्रुते ।
इतिवृत्तमथैतिह्यमाम्नायञ्चामनन्ति तत ।
.ऋषिप्रणीतमार्षंस्यात् सूक्त सूनृतशासनात् ।
धर्मानुशासनाच्चेद धर्मशास्त्रमिति स्मृतम् ॥

—*Ādipurāṇa*, I. 24 and 25,

explaining that इतिहास=इति इह आसीत् (It so happened here).

heritage, has formed from the days of yore an important section of the Indian people and has been drawing its adherents from all the various races, castes and classes inhabiting the different parts of this ancient country. Naturally, the Jainas have contributed a good deal of material which may well be used as a valuable source of history.

The Jaina sources are neither mean nor meagre, but are remarkable for their variety, vastness and chronological sequence. They are spread over the whole range of historical times and are connected with practically every part of the country and with almost every phase of its past history. At the same time they are no less authentic than the contemporary and similar Buddhist or Brahmanical sources. In the words of Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra, "It is an established fact that Jaina literature is as extensive as Buddhist literature, if not more so. The historical information contained in it is supposed to be of a more reliable nature, and is expected to add vastly to our existing knowledge."[1] Dr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri observes that "the Jaina books form one of the primary sources of our knowledge of the internal history of India from the 7th century B.C. to the rise of the Mauryan Empire. And though these books, no less than the Vedic literature, devote themselves more to religious ideas and movements than to historical events, they contain many incidental references to States and their relations which, when sifted, give a clearer idea of the politics of the time than the meagre and confused traditions in the *Purāṇas*."[2]

---

[1] Presidential Address of the History Section of the A.I.O.C., 16th Session, Lucknow, 1951.

[2] *History of India*, Pt. I, p. 39 (Madras, 1950).

From the times of the Mauryas onwards right up to the advent of the Muslims, and in some respects even up to the end of the Muslim period, the Jaina material constitutes a good secondary source. In some cases, as that of Gujarat and several of the principal States of the Deccan and the South, histories of these regions could be reconstructed chiefly with the help of their respective Jaina sources. And for the prehistoric times, prior to the age of Mahāvīra and the Buddha, the Jaina traditions should have the same value and importance as the corresponding Brahmanical traditions. Their mutual agreements and differences, if comparatively studied and critically examined, may reveal many a hitherto unknown fact and may push back farther the limits of historical times.

Moreover, the ancient Jainas seemed to have a love for dates and exactness which is evident from their numerous pontifical genealogies and dynastic chronologies, the dated colophons of their works and of the latter's successive manuscript copies, the historical and even prehistorical traditions recorded with corresponding dates and periods in later works, and from their inscriptional records which reach back to the 5th century B.C. Dr. K.P. Jayaswal once remarked that among the Hindus the Jainas alone have preserved a complete and admirable chronology for the two and a half thousand years or so after Mahāvīra's death.[1] Dr. Bühler also speaks very highly of the authenticity of Jaina traditions and of their value and importance to history.[2] In fact, the Jaina sources have a superiority over other sectarian sources in so far as

[1] *JSS*, I. 4, p. 211.

[2] Bühler, 'On the Authenticity of Jaina Traditions' in *The Indian Sect of the Jains*, pp. 21-23 (tr. Dr. Burgess, London, 1903).

chronology is concerned, especially for the history of ancient India. With their aid many an unknown or doubtful date can be fixed, while those already fixed can further be confirmed. A rational use of these sources can often dispel the confusion usually arising from a similarity of names and circumstances. Besides, the account of historical development of almost every branch of Indian learning and art and of cultural phases and social institutions would be incomplete without incorporating in them the corresponding contributions made by the Jainas.

As a religious and cultural system Jainism is purely indigenous and has many primitive conceptions. It is believed to be the oldest living representative of that ancient Śramaṇa current of Indian culture which was, in its origin, non-Vedic and probably non-Aryan and even pre-Aryan too.[1] It, at least, is a direct representative of the ancient Magadhan culture which represented the stream that was known as Śramanic in contrast to the Brahmanic current of Indian culture.[2] Śramaṇa is a peculiarly Jaina term used to designate a Jaina monk. Mahāvīra is uniformly mentioned as *Samaṇe Bhagavaṁ Mahāvīre* in the Jaina texts.[3]

We need not go into a detailed exposition of the tenets and doctrines of Jainism.[4] It should suffice to

---

[1] Jain J. P., *Jainism, the Oldest Living Religion*, J.C.R.S., Banaras, 1950

[2] Upadhye, A. N., *Pravacanasāra*, R.J.S., Bombay, 1935, Introduction, p. 95; also *JG*, XXX, p. 11.

[3] Upadhye, A. N., op. cit., pp. 87-88, 97, also see Prof. Sukumar Dutt's *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 41.

[4] For these, see J. L. Jaini's *Outlines of Jainism;* Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy* (1st ed.), Vol. I, Chap. on Jaina Philosophy; Upadhye's Introduction to *Pravacanasāra;*

mention that as a religion, it is a complete system with all the necessary branches such as dogma or ontology, metaphysics, philosophy, mythology, ethics, ritual and the rest. And it was Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, the last and twenty-fourth Tīrthaṁkara who, in the 6th century B.C., gave to Jainism its final shape and reorganised the four-fold order of Jaina monks and laity, male and female.

After Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*, this Jaina Saṁgha, by zealously contributing to the all round progress of its religion and culture throughout India during the past twenty-five centuries, highly enriched Indian culture in a number of ways. Vast and varied literature, both religious and secular, numerous monuments, antiquarian remains and artistic relics, beautiful temples, peaceful places of pilgrimage and humanitarian establishments, some characteristic festivals, social practices and institutions, the influence of its ideas on life and thought, and the fact that all these are found scattered among different peoples and parts of the country, bear powerful testimony to its wide prevalence and popularity at one time. And it has been one of the foremost contributors to the cultural unity and historical oneness of India and the Indian people. This religion and its culture have been known by different names and epithets in different times and places, viz., Ṛṣabha cult, Ahiṁsā Dharma, Yogamārga, Vrātya, Ārhat, Śramaṇa or Nirgrantha Dharma, the Gymnosophist or Gymnetai, Syādavāda or Anekānta Mata, the Samāni, the Bhavya, the Sarāka, Bhāvaḍe, Sewaḍe, Śrāvaka, Sarāogī, Jaina,

---

Jacobi's *Metaphysics and Ethics of the Jainas*, *JA*, X, i, p. 40; Schubring's *Die Lehre der Jainas*, etc.; and the original Jaina works on these subjects.

etc.[1] It may be added that Jaina missionaries were the first preachers and religious teachers to devote to the indigenous population.[2]

Since the advent of Islam into India, however, Jainism has generally suffered in the number of its adherents, royal and popular patronage, its political and communal power and even in its religious and ethical influence. But notwithstanding this apparent decline in its fortunes, Jainism is still a living religion and the Jaina community still forms an important section of the middle and upper middle classes of Indian people. It has also preserved in a large measure the originality and integrity of its system as also its remarkable cultural heritage which is quite rich in historical material as well.

The fixing up of the historicity of Jainism in modern times has an interesting history of its own. It was only towards the close of the last century that the researches of Jacobi together with those of Bühler, Guerinot and several other scholars proved beyond doubt that Mahāvīra, the last Jaina Tīrthaṁkara, was not only a senior contemporary and powerful rival of Gautama Buddha, but that at the period of Mahāvīra, and even before it, Jainism had been for a considerable time a firmly established religion, and that Mahāvīra did only reform it as he also reorganised the order of the ascetics.[3]

---

[1] Weber, *IA*, XXX, p. 280; Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*. pp 120 ff, *JG*, XXXI, p. 6; *Mod. Rev.*, 1929, p. 499, *JBORS*, V, pp. 554-58; etc.

[2] Gustav Oppert, *On the Original Inhabitants of Bhāratavarṣa* (Westminster and Leipzig, 1893), p. 100, also p. 62.

[3] *SBE*, Vols. XXII & XLV, Introductions.

As to the inception of Jaina studies in modern times the first conscious contributions to Jainism of early European orientalists commenced with the writings of Lt. Wilfred, viz., 'On the Antipathy of the Brahmins to the Jainas' and 'An Account of the Jainas and their Religion,' published in the *Asiatic Researches*, (Vol. III, pp. 51 and 192) in A.D. 1779. In A.D. 1809 was published Col. Mackenzie's 'An Account of the Jainas.'[1] He was fortunate in obtaining the cooperation of a Jaina paṇḍit, probably Devacandra, the reputed author of the *Rājāvalī-kathe*, which facilitated his investigations about the Jainas and their religion. The same year H.T. Colebrooke's 'Observations on the Jainas' was published.[2] This most eminent Sanskritist amongst early orientalists was the first scholar in modern times to give a tolerably correct and unprejudiced information about Jainism and to be impressed with the independent and antique character of this religion. In 1825, Father J.A. Dubois published his *Memoirs* from Paris, and they contained much appreciative material on the Jaina community and its religion. At this very time Col. James Todd was compiling his monumental work *The Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* with the help of another Jaina scholar, Yati Gyanacandra. In these *Annals*, Todd, while dealing with the history of the various Rājpūt clans and kingdoms of Rājasthān also gave valuable information about the part played by the Jainas in the religious, social and political life of those regions. It was also in 1825 that A. Sterling,

---

[1] *Asiatic Researches*, IX, p. 244. His writings have been edited in the form of *Mackenzie Collection* by H. Wilson. Also see J. Burgess's *Extracts from the Journal of Col. Mackenzie's Pundit.*

[2] *Asiatic Researches*, IX, p. 186.

by publishing his paper on 'The Jaina Caves of Orissa,' was the first to start studies in Jaina archæology and epigraphy. In 1827, Franklin, Hamilton and Delmaine published their respective papers on Jainism. And up to the middle of the century H.H. Wilson, J. Stevenson, J. Prinsep, J. Fergusson and other scholars by their respective writings gave more and more information about Jainism and Jaina culture.

But a systematic study and scientific research in Jaina religion, philosophy, culture, history and literature came to be seriously undertaken only towards the last quarter of the 19th century. The printing press had already been introduced into India. The movement for printing and publishing old manuscripts was started. As early as A.D. 1850, the first Jaina work, *Sādhuvandanā* of Banarsidas (*c.* A.D. 1640), was published from Agra. In the last quarter of the century several Jaina periodicals were started and cultural associations were formed. A number of Jaina scholars and leaders began to give willing cooperation to orientalists and other scholars working in this field.

It was at this time that oriental scholars got access to the Jaina Bhaṇḍāras. Due to the efforts of some provincial Governments many Jaina manuscripts were brought to light; some of them were welcomed by European universities that were taking keen interest in Indological studies, and many others were collected and catalogued in India by experts. The reports prepared by Bhandarkar, Peterson, Hiralal and others contained such a rich harvest of new material that many scholars came to be interested in the study of Jaina literature and chronology as a part of Indian literature and history. The impetus thus gained created the need for a Jaina Bibliography. And it was readily fulfilled by

the French scholar Dr. A. Guerinot through his *Essai de Bibliographica Jaina* and *Repertoire le Epigraphica Jainica*. They are very comprehensive works and deal with references up to A.D. 1905. *The Jaina Bibliography* (Calcutta, 1945) by B. Chhotelal attempted to supplement Guerinot's work by bringing up the references to A.D. 1925. R.B. Lala Parasdas of Delhi had also published in 1930 his *Jaina Bibliography No.* 1 which dealt with some 1,294 works having Jaina references. A remarkable catalogue of Jaina manuscripts has been prepared by Prof. H.D. Velankar of Bombay and published by Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, under the name of *Jinaratnakoṣa*, in 1944. It is an alphabetical register of some ten thousand Jaina works and their authors, giving brief descriptions of each. The author of the present work has also prepared a descriptive catalogue of all the Jaina works published in different languages since the beginning of printing up to A.D. 1945, and their number reaches to about 6,000. Of these, more than 300 are in English or other European languages, about 250 of them being original while some 60 are translations of old Jaina works.[1] Several collections of Jaina inscriptions and Jaina manuscript-colophons and catalogues of manuscripts in Jaina Bhaṇḍāras have been published. In the past few decades English and Hindi translations, editions and compilations of many important Jaina works—metaphysical philosophical, scientific, literary, historical and others—have been produced, and some of these editions are critical and of a high standard. Besides these, a number of historical books relating to

[1] *Prakāśita Jaina Sāhitya*, published by Jaina Mitra Mandala, Delhi, June 1958; also see 'Jaina Literature in English,' *JG*, XLVII, 12, p. 145, etc.

Jainism have also come out. These are : V. Smith's *Jaina Stupa and Other Antiquities of Mathura*, M.S. Ramaswami Ayangar's *Studies in South Indian Jainism*, P. Sheshagiri Rao's *Jainism in the Deccan* and *Āndhra Karṇāṭa Jainism*, C.J. Shah's *Jainism in Northern India*, U.D. Barodia's *History and Literature of Jainism*, T.N. Ramachandran's *Jaina Monuments of India*, B.A. Saletore's *Mediaeval Jainism*, Srikantha Sastri's *Sources of Karṇātaka Culture*, S. R. Sharma's *Jainism and Karṇātaka Culture*, Dr. Jagdish Chandra's *Life in Ancient India as depicted in the Jaina Canons*, B.C. Bhattacharya's *Jaina Iconography*, M. Bloomfield's *Life and Stories of the Jaina Saviour Pārśvanātha*, B.C. Law's *Mahāvīra—His Life and Teachings*, A. Chakravarti's *Jaina Literature in Tamil*, U.S. Tank's *Jaina Historical Studies*, Prof. Handiqui's *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, etc. For the past few years the All India Oriental Conference has also been running a regular department called the Prakrit and Jaina Section and the presidential addresses and papers read in that section in the annual sessions of the Conference give a good idea of the progress of Jaina studies, while Winternitz's 'Outline of Jaina Literature' in his *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, and Schubring's survey of Jaina doctrines in his *Die Lehre der Jainas* may be regarded as phenomenal landmarks in the progress of these studies. In fact, Jainology has now come to be regarded as a separate and distinct subject.

Thus it is only during the past fifty years or so that scholars have devoted some thought to the Jaina literature which had remained so long in partial oblivion, and they are beginning to realise its importance even as a prolific source of history.

CHAPTER I

THE JAINA SOURCES OF HISTORY

THE regular history of India begins with the rise of the Bimbisāra dynasty of Magadha in about the sixth century B.C. And for the ancient period of our history, apart from archæology, epigraphy, numismatics and foreigners' accounts, our principal source of information is literature, both secular and religious, produced and preserved by the different sects and religious communities which flourished side by side during that period.

The most important communities to whom we are indebted for these literary sources are, without doubt, the Hindus, the Buddhists and the Jainas. Of these the Buddhist sources have long been fully studied and explored. The Brahmanical sources have also been exhaustively studied and continue to engage the attention of scholars. The Jaina sources, on the other hand, have so far been utilized to a small extent. The little and scattered work that has been done on them is, however, enough to indicate their possibilities and to impress their value as a rich source of historical material. Moreover, the ancient Jainas seem to have had a singular love for dates, and sometimes these dates have been found to be so definite that one often feels that Whitney's oft-quoted remark that 'all dates given in Indian literary history are pins set up to be bowled down again,' though might have been true in 1879, should be quoted with certain reservations now.

To give in brief the genesis of Jaina literature, it may be asserted that the Jainas have all along been a

peace-loving community, nurturing tastes and tendencies favourable for developing art and literature. In Jainism, greater prestige is attached to the ascetic institution which forms an integral part of the Jaina Saṁgha (social organisation), made up of monks, nuns and the laity.

The members of the ascetic institution naturally and necessarily devoted a major portion of their time to the study of scriptures and composition of fresh treatises for the benefit of suffering humanity. Thus generations of Jaina monks have enriched, according to their training, temperament and taste, various branches of Indian literature. The munificence of the wealthy section of the community and royal patronage have uniformly encouraged both monks and laymen in their literary pursuits in different parts of the country. The importance of scriptural knowledge in attaining liberation and the emphasis laid on *Śāstradāna* have enkindled an inborn zeal in the Jaina community for the composition and preservation of literary works, both religious and secular, the latter too, very often, serving some religious purpose directly or indirectly. The zeal of *Śāstradāna* had so much permeated the hearts of pious Jainas that they took special interest in getting the manuscripts of books prepared and distributed among the worthy. To quote a typical instance, Attimabbe, a pious lady, had a thousand copies of the Kannada *Śāntipurāṇa* of Ponna made and distributed[1] about A.D. 973. This zeal for the preservation and propagation of literature assumed a concrete form in the establishment of Sruta-bhaṇḍāras all over the country.

---

[1] *JRAS*, 1883, pp. 301-2; *MJ*, p. 156.

The early literature of the Jainas is in Prakrit, but their authors never attached a slavish sanctity to any particular language. Preaching of religious principles in an instructive and entertaining form was their chief aim, and language was just a means to this end. According to regions and the spirit of the age the Jaina authors adopted various languages for their compositions. The result has been unique; they enriched various branches of literature in Prakrit, Sanskrit, Apabhraṁśa, Old Rajasthani, Old Hindi, Old Gujarati, Tamil, Kannada, etc. In every language their achievements are worthy of special attention. The credit of inaugurating an Augustan age in Apabhraṁśa, Tamil and Kannada unquestionably goes to Jaina authors; and it is impossible to reconstruct the evolution of Rajasthani, Gujarati and Hindi by ignoring the rich philological material found in Jaina works, the manuscripts of which bearing different dates are available in plenty.[1] Their achievements are equally great in Sanskrit literature, the value of which is being assessed by research scholars. The Jaina works in different languages often show mutual relation, and their comparative study is likely to give chronological clues and socio-historical facts.[2] Moreover, Indian literature, generally speaking, lacks in definite data of authors and their works; but the Jaina author is almost always an exception to this rule. If he is a monk, he specifies his ascetic congregation and mentions his predecessor and teachers; if he is a layman, he would give some personal details and refer to his patron and teacher;

[1] Upadhye, A.N., Introduction to *PJVS* (Sarsawa, 1950).

[2] For an illustration, see Upadhye's observations on the *Dharmaparīkṣā* in his Presidential Address, A.I.O.C. (Hyderabad, 1941), p. 15.

and in most cases the date and place of composition are mentioned.

According to the Jaina belief, the ultimate source of all knowledge is the *Dvādaśāṅga-śruta* as taught by successive Tīrthaṁkaras, and in the end by Mahāvīra (6th century B.C.). The teachings of this last Arhat are believed to have been arranged and classified by his chief disciple Indrabhūti Gautama into twelve principal divisions or the *aṅgas*. The most important of these *aṅgas* was the twelfth, the *Dṛṣṭi-pravāda*, which in its turn, had five sections. The biggest and most important of these sections was that of the *pūrvas*, fourteen in number. Another of these sections was the *prathamānuyoga* and dealt with traditional history up to the time of Mahāvīra. Besides these twelve *aṅgas*, there was the *Aṅga-vāhya-jñāna*, again divided into fourteen *prakīrṇakas* (or scattered bits). Some of the available *painnas* are said to have been ultimately related to this branch.

The whole of this knowledge was kept intact up to the time of Bhadrabāhu I, the eighth pontiff in succession after Mahāvīra. After him it gradually began to suffer losses and dwindle in volume. Thus by the beginning of the Christian era only a partial knowledge of the more relevant portions of the original canon could survive in the memory of a few eminent teachers. Thanks to the Sarasvatī Movement,[1] the Jaina gurus of this time at last overcame their reluctance to take recourse to pen and paper. The Digambara section took the lead in this respect, redacted their part of the traditional canon and wrote independent treatises on various topics which they claimed were based on the traditional know-

[1] See Chapter V.

ledge handed down to them orally in the circle of learned ascetics. The Śvetāmbara section, however, continued to oppose writing for several centuries more, and it was only in the later half of the 5th century A.D. that they finally redacted their own canonical traditions.

These two sets of the extant canonical texts together make up the more or less complete traditional Jaina canon. The Digambaras claim to have preserved in their canonical texts most of the twelfth *aṅga* and its *pūrvas* together with fragments from the other *aṅgas*, while the Śvetāmbaras in their *sūtras* claim to have preserved most of the remaining eleven *aṅgas*. That both of them inherited and drew from the common stock which existed before the schism in the Jaina Saṁgha (A.D. 79) is proved by many ancient verses and passages found common in the two sets of early Jaina literature.[1] And on philological grounds many scholars are of opinion that portions of these texts may well be assigned to the 5th or 4th century B.C.[2]

Thus, though the literary traditions of the Jainas go back almost to the times of Mahāvīra, their literary activity commenced in a regular form only about the beginning of the Christian era. It went on gathering force during the succeeding centuries, and the thousand years from Samantabhadra to Hemacandra (2nd to 12th century A.D.) marked the golden age of Jainism in general and of its literature in particular, especially the mid centuries (5th to 10th) of that millennium.

As a possible source of historical information, the known and available Jaina material may be classified as follows:

---

[1] *Pravacanasāra* (Bombay, 1935), Introduction, p. 24.
[2] ibid., also see Introductions to *SBE*, Vols. XXII and XLV; *IA*, IX, p. 161.

HISTORICAL LITERATURE

(a) HISTORIES :

(*i*) *Socio-political*.—Under this section we have first the dynastic chronologies of India, particularly with reference to Ujjayinī, for the one thousand years or so after the death of Mahāvīra. These records have been preserved in several works belonging to our period, namely the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, *Harivaṁśa-purāṇa*, *Āvaśyakavṛtti*, *Titthogāli-painna* and *Mahāpurāṇa*, and in a number of later works like *Trilokasāra*, *Pariśiṣṭaparva*, *Tīrthoddhāra-prakaraṇa*, *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi*, etc.[1] From these sources we get three, slightly different from each other, versions of the said historical tradition. A comparative study of these will be found useful in reconstructing the political chronology of the post-Mahāvīra period. They also throw light on the starting points of the Śaka, Vikrama and Early Śaka eras, and help in fixing the date of Mahāvīra.

Secondly, there are works like the *Kadamba-purāṇa*, *Bhuvanapradīpikā* and *Rājāvalī-kathe*, which deal with the history of important Jaina gurus and laymen in the background of general history. Although these works are of a quasi-historical nature and of a late date, often mixing fiction with fact, and have also been found to have made many a wrong statement and confused identities or traditions, they still contain much useful material. In this connection, mention may also be made of *Mūtā-Nainsi-kī-Khyāta* which is one of the best mediaeval histories. In this work its author has dealt with the history of several of the principal states of Rajasthan in a very scientific and most secular way. If a proper search is made of the different Jaina Bhaṇḍāras there is a likelihood of discovering many

[1] See Appendix A (ii).

a historical document, even political chronologies or dynastic lists relating to later times.

(*ii*) *Religious*.—Certain works like the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, *Jambudvīpa-prajñapti-saṁgraha*, *Dhavala*, *Jayadhavala*, *Harivaṁśa* and *Ādipurāṇa* and the later *Śrutāvatāras* contain a record of the history of pontifical succession for about seven centuries after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*, of the gradual decline in the canonical knowledge and of its final redaction.[1] The Śvetāmbara version of the history of pontifical succession, of the three councils, of the canonical traditions and of their final redaction can be gleaned from the *Titthogāli-painna* and the *Cūrṇis* of the *Āvaśyaka-* and the *Nandi-sūtras*.[2]

Then there are works like the *Darśanasāra*, Merutunga's *Sthavirāvali* (A.D. 1304) and the *Munivaṁśābhyudaya* (A.D. 1680) which deal with the history of the Jaina Samgha and its subsequent schisms.

(b) PATTĀVALIS:

Closely related to No. ii above, there are the numerous *Paṭṭāvalis* and *Guruvāvalis* (pontifical succession lists) of the different Jaina ascetic congregations—the Samghas, Ganas, Gacchas, etc., that developed in both the sects during the past two thousand years. These documents, besides the respective genealogies, contain the accounts of the achievements of important gurus in greater detail, often giving the names of the royal patrons and devotees of such gurus, and also supplying useful historical, cultural and geographical information.[3]

---

[1] See *Ṣaṭakhaṇḍāgama*, I. 1. (1), Introduction (Amraoti); *Jayadhavala*, I. 1, Introduction (Mathura, 1944).

[2] Jaina Canons, etc., *JA*, XI, 2, pp. 18-20; Weber's *Sacred Literature of the Jainas*, pp. 54 ff.

[3] More important of the Digambara *Paṭṭāvalis* have been

(c) HISTORICAL BIOGRAPHIES :

There are a number of biographical accounts dealing with the life stories of some historical Jaina heroes like Pārśva, Mahāvīra, Gautama, Jambu, Bhadrabāhu, Karkaṇḍu, Sreṇika, Abhayakumāra, Jīvandhara, Sudarśana Seth, Kālakasūri, Kundakunda, Pūjyapāda, Akalaṅka, Haribhadra, etc. They, no doubt, chiefly deal with the spiritual life and religious deeds of their heroes and assume a legendary form, yet they are our only source. If carefully studied and critically examined they supply us with such salient facts about the lives of these heroes as may be taken to be reliable. A few of them were written prior to A.D. 900 but the rest belong to later centuries.

(d) PRABANDHAS :

These are collections of similar biographical accounts of ancient Jaina persons of note, mostly historical. These works are several in number and were written by the Śvetāmbara scholars of Gujarat from the 13th to the 15th century. Though to a great extent legendary in character they contain much useful historical material and, in particular, have been found very valuable for a reconstruction of the history of Gujarat.

(e) COLOPHONS :

Colophons constitute our most valuable literary source of history. These *praśastis* are generally found

published in *JSB*, I. 1, p. 37; I. 2-3, p. 32; I. 4, pp. 43, 51, 71, 78, 81, 103, *JA*, XV. 2, pp. 1-7; *Peterson's Report*, II, 1883-4, pp. 163-166; Hoernle, *IA*, XX, pp. 341-361; XXI, pp. 57-84; *Bhandarkar's Report* 1883-4, p. 320. A collection of Śvetāmbara *Paṭṭāvalis* has been published by Muni Darśanavijaya in the form of *Paṭṭāvali-samuccaya*; also see *IA*, XI, p. 245, pp. 233-242.

at the end of Jaina works, sometimes also at the beginning or, in the form of *puṣpikās*, at the end of some or all chapters of a work. In the works produced prior to A.D. 600 we usually do not find any *praśastis*, but from the 7th century onwards we find the practice becoming more and more popular.

These *praśastis* are generally of three types—first, the *praśasti* of the author which gives details about himself, his religious genealogy, when and for whom he wrote the work, etc., sometimes mentioning the name of the place and that of the ruler of the territory as well; second, the *lekhaka-praśasti* which gives information about the copyist and for whom he copied, etc.; and lastly, the *praśasti* of the donor, which gives facts about his family and about the guru to whom the manuscript was given as a gift. Such information is more plentiful in manuscripts from Gujarat and Central India than in those from Karnataka and the Tamil country. In the works of the period under survey only the first type is found as few manuscripts dated prior to the 10th century have yet been discovered. In piecing together information about Indian history the *praśastis* of Jaina authors should form a valuable source. If these are duly coordinated and studied along with the *pratimā-lekhas*, plenty of which are found inscribed on Jaina images and many of which have also been published, and with other Jaina inscriptions, not only would new facts come to light, but well-known facts would also show inter-relations, and we would be obtaining very good results in our chronological studies.[1]

[1] Srikantha Sastri in his *Sources of Karnataka History*, Vol. I (Mysore, 1940), has made good use of some of the Jaina colophons. Several collections of these colophons have been published from Arrah, Ahmedabad, Sarsawa, Jaipur, etc.

(f) SUNDRY REFERENCES:

A number of works, even if they do not contain a regular colophon, often contain sundry references to previous authors or works, particularly relating to their own subject and incidentally even to some important facts about contemporary history. References to arlier and by later authors and works, refutations of earlier views of established authorship, the nature of language and contents, quotations from earlier works, etc., are the various facts from which relative chronology of authors can be ascertained. This is particularly true of our logico-philosophical literature which helps in a remarkable way in not only fixing the chronological sequence of Jaina authors, but also of the important Brahmanic and Buddhist logicians and philosophers of the period under review. It is customary with our authors to often quote verses of earlier authors either to confirm their own views or to refute those of others. Many a time the names of works and authors are also mentioned. These quotations often enable us to settle relative ages of and to put at least broad but definite limits to the periods of different authors.

KATHĀKOṢA AND STORY-LITERATURE

Story-literature of the Jainas is very extensive; they seem to have cultivated the art of story-telling from the earliest times. This branch of literature is found in three forms :—

(a) The *Kathākoṣas* of which Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhat-kathākoṣa*[1] is the most popular, consist of the sevreal commentaries on the *Mūla-ārādhanā* and of a number of

[1] Ed. A.N. Upadhye (Bombay, 1943).

Ārādhanā-kathākoṣas. The Jaina *Kathā* literature gives an important stream of Jaina tradition and is best represented by these works. Their authors appear to have derived most of their traditions from an earlier *Ārādhanā* text, the *Mūla-ārādhanā* of Śivārya, composed in metrical Prakrit and assigned to 1st century A.D. But even this text does not appear to be the primary or only source, for the fossils of many a tradition found recorded in it are seen embedded in the literary stratum of the *painnas* (Miscellanea) which are included in the canon of the Śvetāmbaras and in the Secondary canon (*Aṅga-bāhya*) of the Digambaras. The lower limit to which the *painnas* could be assigned, might be fixed at about 100 B.C. at the latest.[1] Besides the *Ārādhanā-kathākoṣas* there are a number of other collections of stories such as the *Puṇyāsrava-kathākoṣas*, the many *Vrata-kathākoṣas*, the *Kathāvalis*, works like *Samyaktva-kaumudī*, and so on.

(b) Independent works of fiction such as *Samarāditya-kathā*, *Kuvalayamālā*, *Upamiti-bhavaprapañca-kathā*, *Dhūrtākhyāna*, *Dharmaparīkṣā*, *Tilakamañjarī*, *Rambhāmañjarī*, *Ratnacūḍa-kī-kathā*, *Śukasaptati*, etc., include romances, tales of adventure, animal stories, folklore, some fine specimens of early ontological Indian novels and beautiful allegories and satires.

(c) Then there are numerous stories generally used to illustrate some metaphysical or ethical truth and found scattered in the commentaries of the Śvetāmbara *Āgama-sūtras* and in the ontological, didactic or ethical works of the Digambaras.

This Jaina story-literature, besides representing a particular stream of historical tradition relating to earlier

[1] Chatterjee, C.D., 'Early Life of Chandragupta Maurya from Jaina Sources,' *B.C. Law Volume*, pt. 1, pp. 609-10.

times and alluding now and then to contemporary events, often furnishes a faithful reflection of life and society, customs and practices, and of religious, social, economic and cultural conditions of the times and regions in which the different works were composed. The importance and worth of the Jaina story-literature has found due recognition at the hands of many Indian as well as European scholars. These stories have been found to be purely indigenous and mostly original. Their realistic note and entertainment value, it is believed, have made them the principal source of Indian folk-tales. Many of these stories are said to have travelled to Europe via Persia. It is said that all the *Pañcatantra* editions published in Europe are Jaina recensions of that celebrated work, and that as a complete book the Jaina *Śukasaptati* (The Parrot's Tale) was translated into Persian and taken to Europe by the Muhammedans. The ultimate source of many a European tale has been traced to the Jaina *Kathā* literature.[1]

PURĀṆIC LITERATURE

The Purāṇic literature of the Jainas consists of two classes: (a) the *Purāṇas* or bigger epics, and (b) the *Purāṇic-caritras* or smaller epics.

The ultimate source of the Jaina Purāṇic literature was the *Prathamānuyoga* which formed the third section of the last *aṅga* of the original canon. In Mahāvīra's

---

[1] For Jaina story literature, see C.H. Tawney's Introduction to his *Treasury of Stories*; Johannes Hertel's Introduction to *Pañcatantra* and his *On the Literature of the Śvetāmbaras of Gujerat*, p. 1, etc.; Bühler's Intro. to *Daśakumāracarita*; Upadhye's Introd. to *Bṛhat-kathākośa*; *JUPHS*, XX, 1-2, pp. 74-85; Summaries of A.I.O.C., 16th Session (Lucknow, 1951), p. 188; *IA*, XLII, p. 241, etc.

times its bulk is said to have been only 5000 *padas*.[1] The comparatively small size of this section of the *Anga-pūrva-jñāna* shows that it consisted of brief aphoristic accounts of the nature of *Gāthā-nibaddha-nāmāvalis* and *Kathāsūtras*. The early *Purāṇa* writers are often found referring to such traditional Prakrit *Nāmāvalis* and *Kathāsūtras* as their principal sources. The *Prathamānuyoga* is said to have contained the *Purāṇas* of 24 Tīrthaṁkaras, 12 Cakravartins, 9 Balabhadras, 9 Nārāyaṇas and 9 Prati-nārāyaṇas, who constitute the Tri-ṣaṣṭi-Śalākā-Puruṣas or the 63 all important personages of the Jaina tradition. It also gives an account of the families of the Jinas, the Vidyādharas, the Cakravartins, the Cāraṇas, the kings, etc.[2] According to one classification the *Purāṇas* are of twelve kinds, since they deal with twelve different Jina families and royal dynasties,[3] whereas according to another classification they are of five kinds since they deal with region, time, religious epoch, great personages and their deeds.[4] Moreover the Jainas are one with the Brahmanas in their technical definition of *Purāna* inasmuch

---

[1] Jinasena's *Ādipurāna—Mahāpurāna* (Banaras, 1951), Pt. I, chapter 2, vv. 98, 106, 111, and p. 40, f.n. 5.

[2] जो पुण पढमाणिओओ सो चउवीस तित्थयर बारहचक्कवट्टिणवबलणव णारायण णव पणिसत्तूण पुराण, जिण-विज्जहर-चक्कवट्टि-चारण-रायदीणबसे य वण्णेदि ।—*Kasāya-pābuda* (*Jayadhavala*), Pt. I, p. 1,8 (Mathura, 1944). Also see *Sthānānga-sūtra*, pp. 143, 667.

[3] बारहविह पुराण जगदिटठ जिणवरेंहिसव्वेंहि ।
तसव्व वण्णेदिहु जिणवसे रायवसेय ।।
पढमो अरहताण विदियोपुण चक्कवट्टि वसोदु,....
—*Ṣatakhāṇḍāgama*, I. 1. (i), p. 112 (Amraoti ed.).

[4] सचधर्मं पुराणार्थं पुराण पञ्चधाविदु. ।
क्षेत्रं कालश्च तीर्थश्च सत्पुसस्तद्विचेष्टितम्।।
—*Ādipurāṇa*, chapter 2, v. 38.

as it professes to narrate the dynastic histories[1] and constitutes tradition in its true sense, viz., इत्येवमनुश्रुतम् or इत्यनुश्रुयते[2] (what we heard from our predecessors).[3] Kauṭilya also, in his *Arthaśāstra*, makes Purāṇa an essential constituent of history,[4] which according to the *Yajurvedīya Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* was included in the eighteen *śāstras*.

The ancient Prakrit Jaina text, *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, contains the skeletal material of the Jaina *Mahāpurāna*. The first Jaina *Purāṇa*, the Prakrit *Paum-cariu* (i.e., *Rāmāyaṇa*) of Vimala Sūri, seems to have been written in the beginning of the 1st century A.D. Kavi Parameśvara (*circa* A D 400) is, by later references, known to have incorporated in his *Vāgārtha-saṁgraha* the complete Jaina *Mahāpurāna* or *Triṣaṣṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-carita*. Of the available Jaina *Purāṇas*, excepting the above-mentioned *Paum-cariu*, the principal ones were written from the 6th to the 9th century A.D. On the basis of these, numerous Jaina *Purāṇas* were written in different languages from the 10th century onwards.

The practice of writing *Purāṇic-caritras* dealing with the lives of individual heroes had also begun by the 6th century A.D., and several of them belonging to

---

[1] सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वशोमन्वन्तराणिच ।
सर्व्वेष्वेतेषु कथ्यन्ते वशानुचारितञ्चयत् ॥
यदेतेन तव मैत्रेय पुराणकथ्यते मया'........
—*Viṣṇupurāṇa*, Pt. III, ch. 6, vv. 25-26.

[2] Compare *Ādipurāna*, ch. 1, v. 149. Also see other verses of the same chapter in which the author has fully explained the meaning of *Purāna*.

[3] In his work *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (p. 18), Prof. Pargiter uses the word 'tradition' in this very sense.

[4] पुराणमितिवृत्तमाख्यायिकोदाहरण ।
धर्मशास्त्रमर्थशास्त्र चेतिहास ॥
—*Arthaśāstra*.

that period are available. Hundreds of others were written in later times.

This extensive Purāṇic literature of the Jainas, as a fruitful source of ancient Indian historical traditions relating to pre-historic times, has the same value as the Brahmanic *Purāṇas* and the Buddhist *Jātakas*.[1] Besides being lively narratives these works contain vivid pictures of the life and society in its various aspects, as obtained in the times of their respective authors.

GEOGRAPHY

Several works like the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, *Lokavibhāga*, *Jambu-dvīpa-prajñapti-saṁgraha* and *Trilokasāra* which principally deal with cosmology from the Jaina point of view in their accounts of Jambudvīpa and Bharatakṣetra give an interesting idea about the geographical notions of ancient Indians. The commentaries on the *Tattvārthasūtra* and on the Digambara and Śvetāmbara *Āgamas* substantiate this source on the point. The *Purāṇas* and the *Āgama-sūtras* contain a fund of information relating to the political geography of ancient India as well. The 16 States (Mahājanapadas), the 25½ Ārya-deśas, the 18 kingdoms (Rājyas), the 10 capital cities, the boundaries of the Madhyadeśa, names of a number of countries many of which were outside India and were non-Aryan (Mlecchadeśas), names of numerous cities many of which can easily be identified, names of a number of non-Aryan and even foreign tribes, the different nationalities who supplied different commodities including slave girls to India, the trade routes,

[1] Rapson, E.J., *Ancient India*, pp. 69-70.

and so on, are likely to throw valuable light on the physical, political and commercial geography of ancient and pre-mediaeval India. The accounts of and references to the Jaina places of pilgrimage, found scattered in the literature of those periods is also quite helpful in the geographical studies of ancient India, since those places continue to be sacred to the Jainas even to this day.[1]

POLITICAL LITERATURE

In the *Nītivākyāmṛta* of Somadeva (A.D. 959) we have an excellent regular treatise on the science and art of politics as it obtained in the India of the period under study.[2] Besides this remarkable treatise, we find useful discussions of political theory and its application in works like *Ādipurāṇa*, parva 42 (*circa* A.D. 840), *Dharma-Śarmābhyudaya*, sarga 18 (*circa* A.D. 900), *Yaśastilaka-campū* (A.D. 959), *Candraprabha-carita* of Vīranandi (A.D. 978).

SECULAR AND SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE

A number of works on the grammar of Prakrit, Sanskrit, Apabhraṁśa, Tamil and Kannada, on lexicon, prosody and poetics, on logic and dialectics, on mathematics, astronomy and astrology, and on medicine and other useful topics written by Jaina writers of the period are available. In later times many more on these and other important subjects including coins, precious stones,

[1] For geographical information in Jaina literature see *Bhārata ke Prācīn Jaina Tīrtha* (J.C.R.S., Banaras, 1952); *Vīra Vihāra Mīmāṁsā* (Delhi, 1946); *Premī Abhinandan Granth*, pp. 250-268 and 473-491; etc.

[2] See the author's paper, 'Political Thought in Pre-Muslim India', *JKHRS*, I. 2, pp. 71-74.

poisons, flowers, birds and beasts, art and architecture, etc., were written. In many cases these works by their references to previous works and authors on the subject help in reconstructing the histories of the development of these different branches of ancient Indian learning.

JAINA COMMENTARIES ON NON-JAINA WORKS

The Jaina scholars have from the earliest times been reputed commentators. They wrote numerous and voluminous commentaries not only on their own canonical texts and other works, but also wrote a large number of valuable commentaries on various philosophical and other secular works of non-Jaina authorship. Many such works have reached us only through Jaina commentaries on them, and had not their manuscripts been preserved in the Jaina Bhaṇḍāras they would have been practically non-existent. Pūjyapāda is said to have written the *Śabdāvatāra-nyāsa* on Pāṇini. Twenty Jaina commentaries on *Sārasvata* grammar, 14 on *Kātantra*,[1] 4 on *Raghuvaṁśa*, 3 on *Meghadūta*, 2 on *Kumārasambhava*, 2 on Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*, commentaries on Mammaṭa's *Kāvyaprakāśa*, Māgha's *Śiśupālavadhā*, Śri Harṣa's *Naiṣadha*, on *Chandānuśāsana*, *Śrutabodhā*, *Vṛttaratnākara* and on many other pieces of classical Sanskrit literature are available.[2] Many Jaina commentaries on important Buddhist and Brahmanical philosophical works, particularly relating to Nyāya,[3] and some 24 commentaries on non-Jaina astronomical and astrological works,[4]

[1] See *Jinaratnakoṣa*, B.O.R.I. (Poona, 1944).

[2] P.C. Nahar, 'A Note on Jaina Classical Literature', A.I.O.C 2nd Session. (Calcutta, 1922); *JG*, 1922, pp. 64-73.

[3] *Premī Abhinandan Granth*, pp. 305-322.

[4] *Varṇī Abhinandan Granth*, p. 484.

have been discovered. Kolācala Mallinātha Sūri, the greatest and most celebrated commentator of Kālidāsa's and of other classical works, is believed to have been a Jaina,[1] and so also Amarasiṁha Gaṇi, the author of *Amarakośa*.[2] The value of these commentaries is obvious in reconstructing the literary history of our country.

RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

This most voluminous stream of Jaina literature consists of the canonical texts of both the sects together with the vast exegetical literature thereon in the form of *Vṛttis*, *Ṭīkās*, *Niryuktis*, *Cūrnis*, *Bhāṣyas*, etc., and of many independent works divided into the four *anuyogas* relating to metaphysics, philosophy, ethics and tradition, respectively. Devotional poems, *Mantraśāstras* and ritualistic and consecrational literature also form a considerable part. These works in their colophons and sundry allusions are often found to supply important bits of historical information.

MANUSCRIPT MATERIAL AND GRANTHA BHAṆḌĀRAS

We have in India numerous Jaina Bhaṇḍāras, big and small, which, on account of their treasures of old, authentic and valuable manuscripts, deserve to be looked upon as a part of our national wealth. Deva, Śāstra and Guru being the three objects of daily worship, *Svādhyāya* of scriptures a daily religious duty and *Śāstradāna* an act of utmost piety, a Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍāra is necessarily attached to every Jaina temple. Older the temple or its locality, greater is the possibility of

[1] Saletore, B.A., *Mediaeval Jainism*, p. 377, f.n. 2.
[2] Mangaldeva Sastri in *Varṇī Abhinandan Granth*, p. 313.

finding a few or more old and valuable manuscripts in its Bhaṇḍāra. There was a time when communal orthodoxy came in the way of opening up these treasures to the world of scholars, but that is no more the case. Due to the efforts of a number of eminent scholars we possess today various descriptive catalogues of Jaina manuscripts Of the more important North Indian Bhaṇḍāras mention may be made of those at Pāṭana (Ahmedabad), Jessalmere, Idar, Nāgaur, Bikaner, Jaipur, Agra, Delhi, Indore, Karanja and Poona, and of the South Indian Bhaṇḍāras, of those at Moodabidri, Humch, Vārangal and Kārkala. Most of these Bhaṇḍāras have not yet been duly inspected and there are no authentic reports of their manuscript collections. Only those of Gujarat are being properly worked upon. A catalogue of some of the Karnataka Bhaṇḍāras, in which piles of palm-leaf manuscripts are preserved, has been recently published from Varanasi. Lists of some of the North Indian Bhaṇḍāras have now and then come out in the Jaina monthly *Anekānta*. A number of manuscripts preserved in these Jaina Bhaṇḍāras go back to the 10th or 11th century A.D. For the study of palæography and calligraphy this material should prove very helpful.[1]

EPIGRAPHY

Innumerable Jaina inscriptions found inscribed on the pedestals of images, on Niṣadyās, Stūpas, Mānastambhas, Āyāgapaṭṭas and metallic Yantras, in temples, places of pilgrimage and other ancient sites and those

[1] cf., H.R. Kapadia, 'Outlines of Palæography and Jaina MSS. (*JBU*, VI, 2; VII, 2), *Jaina Citrakalpadruma* (Ahmedabad, 1935), Introduction. With reference to these Jaina Bhaṇḍāras Dr. G. Bühler once remarked, "These revered old hoards of the Jaina communities do not contain forgeries, but genuine relics of very ancient times." (*IA*, X, p. 44.)

that exist in the form of donative tablets or copper-plate grants, are found scattered all over the country. Like the Jaina manuscripts most of their inscriptions are also dated. A large number of them have been deciphered, edited and published in the Epigraphy volumes, Archæological Survey Reports, *Indian Antiquary* and other collections and research journals. A still larger number yet remains unpublished and even unnoticed. They need to be collected, edited and published with standard translation and notes in one collection.

NUMISMATICS

A study of coins, seals, dynastic or royal ensigns of some of the ancient kings, ruling dynasties or republican states, in the light of distinctive Jaina religious symbols and mystical signs is likely to prove helpful in numismatic studies and in identifying those rulers as well as in determining their religious bias. Practically no attempt has so far been made in this direction.

ICONOGRAPHY

Jaina iconography is an important aspect of ancient Indian iconographic art. J. Burgess, J. L. Jaini, D. R. Bhandarkar, B. C. Bhattacharya, H. D. Sankalia, U. P. Shah and several other scholars have made valuable contributions to this subject. But taking into consideration the large number and variety of Jaina icons and the rich material available in the Jaina texts, the study of this subject still seems to be in its infancy.

ART AND ARCHITECTURE

Jaina monuments of different types have no less value than other contemporary architectural remains

In the study of ancient art and architecture and in tracing the evolution of various styles the numerous Jaina monuments and works of art should prove quite useful.

FESTIVALS, CUSTOMS AND PRACTICES

A study of some of the characteristic Jaina festivals and tracing their history back in literature, epigraphy and archæology would throw interesting light on their origin and evolution. It would further show which of them have been adopted by other communities from the Jainas or vice versa. The present author has thus traced references to the festival of Diwāli chronologically and found it an illuminating study. The study of the development of Jaina rituals and religious as well as social customs and practices provides us with an angle to study the influence of Jaina ideas on Indian society and that of other systems on the Jainas themselves.

CHAPTER II

THE DATE OF MAHĀVĪRA'S NIRVĀṆA

THE date of Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, the last Jaina Tīrthaṁkara, is one of the earliest landmarks in the chronology of ancient India, while it is the very sheet-anchor of Jaina chronology. All dates backwards and forwards are counted from the time of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* which was the starting point of the current Jaina or Mahāvīra era. This event is said to have taken place 250 years after the *nirvāṇa* of Pārśva, the 23rd Tīrthamkara, and 3 years and eight and a half months before the close of the fourth cycle (*caturtha kāla*) of the current *avasarpiṇī* of the present *kalpa*.[1] It coincided with the attainment of *kaivalya* or Arhathood by Mahāvīra's chief disciple and successor Indrabhūti Gautama and by the coronation at Ujjayinī of Pālaka, the son of Caṇḍa Pradyota, the king of Avanti. The *nirvāṇa* is said to have taken place 461 years before the first entry of the Śakas in the Ujjayinī region, 470 years before the commencement of the Vikrama era, 605 years and 5 months before the starting point of the Śaka era, 683 years before the total loss of the verbal tradition of the original canonical knowledge, and 1000 years before the age of the first Kalki.[2] The

[1] According to Jaina belief the eternal time is conceived to have been divided into *kalpas;* every *kalpa* into two sections, *utsarpiṇī* (ascending) and *avasarpiṇī* (descending), each of them in turn into six *kālas* or *yugas*. This makes up the cycle of time. The starting point of this calculation is the first day of the month of Śrāvana.

[2] According to Jaina tradition, after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*,

pontifical genealogy of Mahāvīra's immediate successors runs for 683 years after him, and thence onward, with this as base, begin the histories and genealogies of the different Samghas, Gaṇas, Gacchas, etc. But for this tradition we could not have reconstructed the early ecclesiastical as well as literary history of the Jainas and fixed the dates and settled the sequence of most of the important Jaina gurus and authors of the early centuries of the Christian era. And not only did the Jainas make use of the Mahāvīra era in many of their traditions to denote the dates of persons and events but it was also used by some Jaina authors to denote the date of the completion of their works, and even in some inscriptions. It is still in use for religious purposes.

Vardhamāna Mahāvīra himself occupies an important place in the history of ancient India. A mass of tradition, found recorded in Jaina literature beginning from before the commencement of the Christian era, contains useful and often minute details about his lif and times.[1] His father Siddhārtha was a Kṣatriya prince of Kāśyapa gotra and was the head of the Jñātṛka[2] clan of the Licchavis of Kuṇḍagrāma near Vaiśālī (identified with Basārh in district Muzaffarpur

---

at the end of every 500 years there will be an Upakalki and of every 1000 years a Kalki, both of whom will be irreligrous tyrants.

[1] For example, Kundakunda's *Prākṛtabhaktis* (8 B.C.—A.D. 44), *Tiloyapaṇṇati* (c. A.D. 200), Pūjyapāda's *Daśabhaktis* (c. A.D. 500), *Dhavala* and *Jayadhavala* (A.D. 780), several of the *Āgama-sūtras* and Jaina Purānas.

[2] Pūjyapāda in his *Caritrabhakti* describes him as श्रीमज्ज्ञातकुलेन्दुना, and that is why he was called Jñātṛputra or Nātaputta—the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta by the Buddhists.

3

in Bihar).[1] His mother Triśalā, also called Priyakāriṇī,[2] was a daughter of king Ceṭaka of Vaiśālī, who was also the head of the Vajjian confederacy of republican states.[3] Through his mother Mahāvīra was also related to the ruling houses of Magadha, Kaśī, Kosala, Vatsa, Avanti, Campā and Sindhu-Sauvīra.[4] At about the age of 29 he renounced the world, practised severe austerities for the next 12 years and finally attained enlightenment (*kaivalya*). For the next 30 years or so he wandered from place to place, preaching his faith in the common language of the masses—the Ardha-māgadhi.[5] Mahāvīra's was an outstanding personality and he was a great teacher who is said to have been looked upon as a formidable rival by Gautama Buddha himself.[6] The latter seems to have been a junior contemporary of Mahāvīra. The Jainas have scrupulously preserved important details including the exact times and astral indications of the five auspicious events (*kalyāṇakas*) of his life. And it is stated that Mahāvīra attained *nirvāṇa* at Pāwā, at the age of 71 years, 6 months and 18 days, in the last watch of the night of the 14th day of the dark fortnight of the month of Kārttika, the Nakṣatra at that time being Svāti.[7]

---

[1] See *Vaiśālī* by Vijyendrasuri (Delhi, 1946).

[2] सिद्धार्थनृपतितनयो भारतवास्ये विदेहेकुण्डपुरे।
देव्या प्रियकारिण्या सुस्वप्नात् सप्रदश्य विभु ॥
—*Daśabhakti*, p. 116.

[3] See *Niryāvalias*, p. 27. A Śvetāmbara tradition makes her a sister of Ceṭaka.

[4] Bool Chand, *Mahāvīra*, J.C.R.S., Banaras, 1953, pp. 12-13.

[5] For details of places he went to, see *Harivamśa-purāṇa*; *Vīra Vihāra Mīmāṁsā* (Delhi, 1946); *JSB*, XII, 1, pp. 16-22.

[6] *SBE*, Vols. XXII and XLV, Introductions.

[7] पद्मवनदीर्घिकाकुल विविधद्रुमखण्डमण्डिते रम्ये।
पावानगरोद्याने व्युत्सर्गेणस्थितः स मुनिः ॥१६॥

The ancient Jainas have left no room for doubt or uncertainty as regards the date of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa.* In the present times, they, with practically no exception, and all over the country, seem to believe this era to have started in 527 B.C., and have for long been using it as such. Scholars have also generally accepted this date. But there are some who still entertain serious doubts and have made the date considerably controversial.

The different views on this point may broadly be classed into three categories:

(A) Those which advocate an enhancement in the 527 years' period of pre-Christian era and take the date farther back;

(B) those which are in favour of a reduction in that period and bring forward the date by several decades; and

(C) those which maintain the date of 527 B.C.

A. In the first category, (1) mention may first be made of those scholars who rely on the orthodox Purāṇic traditions and the calculations of early mediaeval astronomers.[1] We need not consider them as they are not strictly historical.

(2) Pt. A. Santiraja Sastri of Mysore has tried to identify the Śakarāja, whom tradition places 605 years after Mahāvīra, with Vikrama (57 B.C.), and thus arrives at 662 B.C. as the date of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa.*[2] The

---

कार्त्तिककृष्णास्यान्ते स्वातावृक्षेनिहत्यकर्मरजः।
अवशेष सप्रापदव्यजरामरमक्षय सौख्यम्॥१७॥

—*Nirvāṇabbakti* by Pūjyapāda.

[1] See M.K. Acarya's article in A.I.O.C. (Poona, 1919), pp. 111-114; Dr. P. S. Sastri in A.I.O.C. (Lucknow, 1951), p. 125.

[2] Diwali number of *Hindi Jaina Gazette*, 1941, in which the original article in Sanskrit was published. Its Hindi translation appeared in the *Anekānta*, IV. 10, pp. 559 ff.

evidence adduced is unworthy of reliance and the arguments given in support lack force.

(3) Dr. K. P. Jayaswal fixed the date of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* in 545 B.C. His main argument was that since according to some Jaina *Paṭṭāvalīs* it was the interval between Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* and Vikrama's birth, and not his accession, which is said to have been 470 years, and since Vikrama ascended the throne and started his era at the age of 18 in 57 B.C., Mahāvīra's date should be pushed farther back by 18 years. He tried to corroborate his theory by a statement of some of the other *Paṭṭāvalis* which give 219 years as the interval between Mahāvīra and the accession of Candragupta Maurya, which according to him is otherwise fixed in November, 325 B.C. He also tried to reconcile his chronology as workd out from the Jaina sources with the Purāṇic traditions, identified the Vikrama with King Puḷumāyi, the son of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi, and fixed the Buddha's *nirvāṇa* in 544 B.C.[1]

The chief defect of Jayaswal's theory is that he made only a partial use of the Jaina sources and only in so far as they supported his theory, and ignored the rest. There may have been differences among Jaina writers as to the actual event in Vikrama's life which marked the commencement of his era, but there is absolute unanimity as to its falling 470 years after the *nirvāṇa*. Moreover, he started with the presumptions that Candragupta Maurya became the king of Magadha in 325 B.C. and that the Buddha had died in 544 B.C. The former is still open to doubts whereas the latter has definitely been brought down to about

[1] 'Saiśunāka and Maurya Chronology', *JBORS*, I, Pt. I, pp. 99-104.

483 B.C. His identification of Vikrama with the Sātavāhana ruler Puḷumāyi is also given no credit to now. We do not know what his stand with regard to the date of Mahāvīra would have been in these changed circumstances.

B. The opinion in favour of a later date is prevailing at present. A large number of modern scholars are inclined to place Mahāvīra's death in the seventies or eighties of the 5th century B.C. They base their reasonings mainly on the presumption that of Mahāvīra and the Buddha, both being known to have been contemporaries of each other, the former could not have predeceased the latter by about half a century as the date of his death has now been more or less definitely fixed at about 483 B.C. Another and apparently stronger presumption is the date of Candragupta Maurya based on the Greek synchronism, with which the date of Mahāvīra is sought to be reconciled.

Thus (1) S. V. Venkateswara puts forth 437 B.C. as the date of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. Believing that the Buddha died sometime between 485 and 453 B.C., and that he could not have died after Mahāvīra, this scholar surmises that the 470 years' tradition relates to the Ananda Vikrama era of A.D. 33.[1] But there is absolutely no tradition which supports this theory. Moreover, as the late Dr. G. H. Ojha showed in his article 'On the Conception of an Ananda Vikrama Era', no such era was ever started or gained currency, nor does it find any mention in the *Pṛthvirāja-rāso* of poet Canda, as is alleged.[2]

(2) Prof. Jarl Charpentier fixed the date of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* as 467 B.C. He started with the presump-

[1] 'The Date of Vardhamāna', *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 122-130.
[2] cf., *Nagari Pracharini Patrika*, Pt. I, pp. 377-454.

tions that the date of the Buddha's death was definitely fixed in 477 B.C., that according to the Buddhist texts Mahāvīra and the Buddha were contemporaries and that they both flourished in the reign of Ajātaśatru. He believed that no person of the name of Vikrama ever existed about 57 B.C., and further that there was a discrepancy of 60 years between the account of other Jaina sources and that of Hemacandra who stated that Candragupta Maurya came to the throne 155 years after Mahāvīra's death. Hence by reducing 60 years from the traditional period of 527 years before Christ, he arrived at the year 467 B.C.[1] The greatest flaw in his reasoning is that he practically ignored Jaina tradition; the only use he made of it is to find an excuse for bringing the date exactly 60 years forward.

(3) Dr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri is also of the same opinion and backs his theory with almost the same arguments. He is, however, conscious of two difficulties which this theory gives rise to : first, that according to it Candragupta's accession would fall in 312 B.C., some 9 or 12 years later than the generally accepted date; second, that it would make the Buddha predecease Mahāvīra as against the evidence of the Buddhist texts. He reconciles the first by saying that Hemacandra's date for Candragupta (i.e., 312 B.C.) must be taken to coincide with some epoch in the history of Jainism which was near enough to Candragupta's accession for the two to be placed together. As regards the second difficulty, he sets it aside by saying, 'we may ignore this isolated statement of the Pāli text.'[2]

---

[1] *IA*, XLIII, June, July, Aug., 1914, pp. 118 ff; also see *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 156.

[2] *History of India* (Madras, 1950), Pt. I, pp. 39-40.

(4) Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri suggests 478 B.C. or 486 B.C. and 536 B.C. as the probable dates of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*, according to the Cantonese reckoning which places the death of the Buddha in 486 B.C., or to the Ceylonese one which places it in 544 B.C., whichever is accepted as the basis. As between 478 B.C. and 486 B.C., the first date is said to be in conformity with Hemacandra who is said to have placed Candragupta's accession in M.E. 155, that is 323 B.C. in this case, which cannot be far from the truth, but that would be at variance with the clear evidence of the Buddhist canonical texts which made the Buddha survive his Jñātṛka rival. Hence he thinks *circa* 486 B.C. is a more likely date as it is also in keeping with Ajātaśatru's accession,[1] in which respect this scholar seems to give more credit to the Jaina and Buddhist traditions.

(5) Prof. C. D. Chatterjee also favours this date of 486 B.C., because he takes 483 B.C. as the definitely fixed and correct date of the Buddha and because he believes, on the basis of 'clear evidence of the Buddhist tradition on this question', that Mahāvīra predeceased the Buddha.[2]

(6) Prof. H. C. Seth fixes the date of Mahāvīra in 488 B.C. He believes that the Buddha died in 487 B.C. By making a comparative study of the Digambara and Śvetāmbara chronological traditions he thinks he has found out a discrepancy of 40 years which must be subtracted from the 470 years, the alleged interval between Mahāvīra and Vikrama.[3]

C. The more important views in the third category are :—

[1] *An Advanced History of India*, p. 73.
[2] *B.C. Law Volume*, Pt. I, pp. 606-607, f.n. 30.
[3] *JA*, XI. 1, pp. 6 ff.

(1) M. Govind Pai, relying on the Burmese tradition, works out the date of the Buddha's enlightenment as 546 B.C., and that of his *Parinirvāṇa* as 501 B.C. And since he gives credit to the Buddhist tradition which makes Mahāvīra a senior contemporary of the Buddha, he places the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra somewhere between 546 and 501 B.C., and considers 527 B.C. as the most probable date for that event.[1]

(2) Pt. J. K. Mukhtar supports the traditional date of 527 B.C. He attempts a refutation of the theory of Jarl Charpentier as also that of Jayaswal by trying to prove that the Vikrama era started neither with the birth nor with the coronation of Vikrama but with his death, and that therefore no addition or reduction in the traditional interval of 470 years was needed. He also believes that the Buddha had died some 7 or 8 years before Mahāvīra.[2] We do not know what he would say in the light of the recently fixed date of the Buddha, i. e., 483 B.C., and if the commencement of the Vikrama era is also proved to coincide with any other event of Vikrama's life and not with his death. Same is the case with the Śaka era which he believes to have started in A.D. 78 at the death of the Śaka king.

(3) Prof. Hiralal is also in favour of the same date and uses almost the same arguments. He tries to reconcile Hemacandra's evidence by presuming that Vikrama was crowned in M.E. 410, ruled for 60 years and died in M.E. 470 when his era started.[3]

(4) Similarly, Muni Kalyanavijaya fixes the date of

---

[1] 'On the Date of the Parinirvāna of the Buddha,' *Prabuddha Karnataka*, Mysore University.

[2] *Bhagwān Mahāvīra aur Unkā Samay*, Delhi, 1934.

[3] *Ṣaṭakhaṇḍāgama* (*Dhavala*), I. 1. 1, Introd., and his article, 'Date of Mahāvīra Nirvāna,' *Journal of Nagpur University*, 1940, pp. 52-53.

Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* in 528 B.C., and believes the Buddha to have died in 542 B.C.[1]

These are in short the more important different, sometimes quite divergent, views on the question of Mahāvīra's date. And we have seen that they are primarily founded on certain presumptions or preconceived notions and more on external than on internal evidence. If we try to fix this date mainly on the basis of the date of the Buddha, which is still highly controversial, or on the basis of the Greek synchronism which is also not an absolutely unquestionably proved fact, we would not do justice to the problem in hand, at least when the different traditions of the Jainas, the Buddhists and the Brahmanas are not unanimous about the period of the interval that had elapsed between the death of Mahāvīra or of the Buddha and the coronation of Candragupta Maurya. What is needed is that the date of Mahāvīra should be fixed on its own merits, on the basis of some more solid and unchangeable data, and then alone should we try to seek reconciliation, as far as possible, with other traditions and known or proved facts of history.

Now, of all the so many eras that started in India in the ancient period of its history, only two have been most popular, have had the widest currency and have survived till today. These are the Vikrama and the Śaka Saṁvats. In spite of many controversies as to how each one of them commenced or who was responsible for it, they are known to have started in 57 B.C. and A.D. 78 respectively, with the well-known interval of

[1] 'Vīra Nirvāna Samvat aur Jaina Kālagaṇanā,' *Nagari Pracharini Patrika*, Vol. X, v.s. 1986, pp. 585-745.

Dr. R.K. Mookerjee also sees no incongruity, far less absurdity, in accepting the traditional date of 528 B.C. (cf., *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. II, pp. 36-38).

135 years between them. If beginning from the present times we trace their use in literature and inscriptions backwards, we can easily prove their consistency by synchronising their dates mutually as also with those in other known eras or reckonings. This process takes us back to well-nigh within a few centuries of their respective points of commencement.

From the 10th century onwards we begin to get such synchronisms in more and more abundance. But even before that, the Deogarh Jaina Pillar Inscription of A.D. 862, of the reign of King Bhojadeva of Kannauj, gives its date both in the Vikrama and the Śaka eras as 919 and 784 respectively. This is perhaps the first epigraphic record which mentions dates in both the eras simultaneously.[1] In the 8th century we have definite evidence that Vīrasena completed his *Dhavala* in V.E. 838 (i.e., A.D. 780) and he is mentioned by Jinasena in his *Harivaṁśa*, completed in S.E. 705 (i.e., A.D. 783). Moreover, both these authors mention several contemporary kings whose dates are otherwise fixed and coincide with these dates. In the 7th century A.D. we get an even more remarkable instance. Harṣavardhana of Kannauj is known to have ruled in A.D. 606-647. Hiuen-Tsang, the Chinese pilgrim, visited India in A.D. 629-644. Cālukya Pulakeśin II ruled over the Deccan in A.D. 608-642. He exchanged embassies with Shah Khusro II of Persia (A.D. 625-626). The Jaina scholar Ravikīrti wrote the Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II in S.E. 556 (i.e., A.D. 634). The Jaina scholar Jinabhadra who completed his work in S. E. 531 (A.D. 609), Akalaṅka who is said to have defeated the Buddhists in V. E. 700 (A.D. 643), Jinadāsa Mahattara who wrote

[1] *EI*, IV, No. 44, pp. 309-310.

his *Cūrṇis* in S. E. 598 (A.D. 676) and Raviṣeṇa who completed his *Padma-carita* in M. E. 1203 (A.D. 676), were all more or less contemporaries and, in one way or the other, associated or interlinked with each other. This is a sure and well-founded synchronism and quite an early one too. Fortunately this multiple synchronism is confirmed by so many and so diverse sources as the Chinese and Persian, North Indian and South Indian, Buddhist and Brahmanical, Digambara and Svetāmbara, inscriptional and literary. And connected therewith we find the specific use of all the three eras, the Mahāvīra, the Vikrama and the Śaka, which is an unquestionable proof of the belief held at least about the middle of the 7th century A.D. that the relation between these eras was the same as it obtains today, that is, they commenced in 527 B.C., 57 B.C. and A.D. 78 respectively. In earlier centuries, too, we get several instances which generally corroborate these results, but since these earlier synchronisms are neither so well-founded nor of an absolutely definite nature they need not be discussed here. It would suffice to mention that no case has yet been known which definitely or positively disproves the above conclusions.

Taking these eras one by one, we begin to find the Śaka era in use from the beginning of its inception for the first 125 years or so in inscriptions from Mathura, from about the middle of the 1st century to almost the beginning of the Gupta rule in the inscriptions of the Western Kṣatrapas, from about the 2nd century onwards in the whole of the Deccan and South India and even in the Indianised kingdoms of the Far East. It also came to be the most favourite era with the Jaina authors and gurus of the peninsula. There is also no doubt that this popular Śaka era

of the South in general and of the Jainas in particular definitely commenced from A.D. 78.

Similarly, the Vikrama era came to have a greater currency and popularity in Upper India, particularly in the regions of Malwa, Gujarat, Central India and Rajasthan. The Jainas of these parts naturally favoured this era as the basis of their reckonings. They never seem to have had any doubts as to its starting point (i.e., 57 B.C.), and they have been most consistent in maintaining their tradition relating to its inception.

Now, the Jaina writers whenever they expressed the date of Mahāvīra, they did it either straightaway in the M.E., or in terms of either the Śaka or the Vikrama era. Unlike the Buddhists, the Jainas have never had any difference of opinion regarding the date of their Tīrthaṁkara. They have been mostly confined to India proper, though widely diffused in practically all parts of the country; and in spite of schismatic tendencies and the predominance of particular sects in particular regions, they remained in constant touch with their co-religionists wherever they were or to whichever sub-sect they belonged.

Moreover, the two most important and fundamental traditions which the Jainas zealously preserved and with a remarkable unanimity, were those relating to the Śrutāvatāra (i.e., the redaction of the canon) and the Kalki. The first gives the pontifical succession after Mahāvīra's death for the next 683 years, informing at the same time how the original canonical knowledge continued to survive till the end of this period in the memory of a succession of saints who could not help its gradual decline and had finally to concede to its redaction. The second tradition relates to the Kalki

who is believed to have flourished at about the close of the first millennium after Mahāvīra's death.[1] In this connection chronological lists of the ruling dynasties, particularly of Ujjayinī, for these one thousand years have been preserved, which end with the Kalki's tyrannical rule.

The first tradition forms the very foundation of Jaina literary as well as ecclesiastical history. With it as a base we can satisfactorily fix the dates and settle the sequence of most of the important Jaina authors and gurus of the first 4 or 5 centuries of the Christian era. This also is the main basis of the histories of all the Saṁghas, Gaṇas, Gacchas, etc., especially of the Digambara sect, which in their respective *Paṭṭāvalis* begin their histories from about the end of this period of 683 years after Mahāvīra's death. They, however, invariably incorporate at their beginning the account of these 683 years in almost the same words as given in the many sources containing a record of that tradition. Moreover, these sources also often throw light on the date of Mahāvīra.

Thus Vīrasena in his *Dhavala*, finished in V. E. 838 (A.D. 780), giving the genealogy of the 28 immediate successors of Mahāvīra, divided into 5 groups together with the periods taken by each group, tells

[1] एववस्ससहस्से पुह कक्की हवेइ इक्केको।
—*Tiloyapaṇṇati.*
मुक्तिगते महावीरे प्रतिवर्षं सहस्रकम्।
एकैको जायतेकल्की जिनधर्मविरोधक.॥
—*Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783).
इदि पडिसहस्सवस्स वीरेकक्कीणदिक्कमेचरिमो।
जलमथणो भविस्सदिकक्की सम्मग्गमत्थणओ॥
—*Trilokasāra* (A.D. 973).
Also see the *Titthogāli-painna*, *Dīpamālā-kalpa*, *Kāla-saptati*, etc.

at the end that 'by deducting 77 years and 7 months from this period of 683 years we get 605 years and 5 months which is the exact interval between Mahāvīra's death and the commencement of the Śaka era'. In support, he also quotes an ancient Prakrit verse which purports to mean that by adding 605 years and 5 months to the current year of the Śaka era we can arrive at the corresponding year of the Mahāvīra era.[1] A similar verse is found in an ancient Śvetāmbara text, the *Titthogālī-painna*.[2] Its first line is identical with that of the verse quoted in the *Dhavala*, but the second line is differently worded though it does not affect the implication. Its '..the Saka king came to be' may well be taken to mean '..the Śaka era commenced.' Yativṛṣabha (*c.* A.D. 176) seems to have been the first to record this tradition,[3] and it is corroborated by Jinasena

[1] सव्वकाल समासो तेयासीदिअहिय छस्सदमेत्तो (६८३), पुणे एत्थ सत्तमासाहिय सत्तहत्तरिवासेमु (७७-७) अवणीदेसु पचमासाहियपचुत्तर छस्सदवासाणि (६०५-५) हवति। एसो वीर जिणिदणिव्वाणगद दिवसादो जाव सगकालस्सआदी होदि, तावदियकालो, कुदो ? एदम्मिकाले सगणरिद कालस्स पक्खित्तेवड्ढमाणजिण णिव्वुदकालागमणादो। वुत्तच—

पच य मासा पच य वासाछच्चेव होति वाससया।
सगकालेण य सहिया थावेयव्वो तदो रासी॥

—MS. in the C.J.O.L., Arrah, p. 537.

[2] पचय मासा पच य वासाछच्चेव होतिवाससया।
परिणिव्वु अस्सऽरिहतो तो उपपन्नो सगोराया॥

—cf., *Paṭṭāvalı Samuccaya*, p. 537.

The text of the *Tıttbogāli-painna* is also reproduced in Kalyanavıjaya's 'Vīra Nırvāna Samvat,' op. cıt.

[3] णिव्वाणे वीरजिणे छव्वाससदेसुपचवरिसेसु।
पणमासेसु गदेसु सजादोसगणिओ अहवा॥

—*Tıloyapaṇṇati*, IV. 1499.

(A.D. 783)[1], Nemicandra (A.D. 973)[2], Merutuṅga (A.D. 1306),[3] and others. It is, therefore, obvious that both the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras have been in perfect agreement as to this interval of 605 years and five months between the starting point of M.E. and S.E., since almost the first century of the Śaka era, which, as we have seen, they believed to have started in A.D. 78. Hence the date of Mahāvīra *nirvāṇa* comes to 527 B.C.

Another class of tradition gives Mahāvīra's date in terms of the Vikrama era. The Prakrit *Paṭṭāvali* of the Nandi Saṁgha, which is also one of the oldest Digambara *Paṭṭāvalis*, the equally old Śvetāmbara *Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvali*, Haribhadra's *Āvaśyakavṛtti* (*c.* A.D. 775), the *Tīrthoddhāra-prakaraṇa* and several other works unanimously state that Mahāvīra died 470 years before the commencement of the Vikrama era.[4] Except the first,

---

[1] वर्षाणाषट्शतीत्यक्त्वापचाग्रा मास पचकम् ।
मुक्तिगते महावीरे शकराजस्ततोऽभवत् ।
—*Harivaṁśa*, ch. 60, v. 549.

[2] पणछस्सय वस्सपणमासजुद गमियवीरणिव्वुइदो ।
सगराजो तोकक्की चदुणवतिय महियसगमास ॥
—*Trilokasāra*, v. 850.

[3] श्री वीर निर्वृतेर्वर्षः षड्भिः पचोत्तरै. शतै ।
शाक सवत्सरस्यैषाप्रवृत्तिर्भरतेऽ भवत् ॥
—*Vicāraśreṇī*. The verse has, in fact, been quoted by Merutunga from some older work.

[4] सत्तरि चदुसदजुत्तोतिणकाला विक्कमो हवइजम्मो ।
—*Vikrama Prabandha* in the Prakrit *Paṭṭāvalī* of Nandi Saṁgha (cf., *JSB*, I. 4, p. 75).

तद्राज्यंतु श्रीवीरात् सप्ततिवर्षशत चतुष्टये सजातम् ।
—*Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvali*, quoted in the Introduction to *Ṣaṭakhaṇḍāgama*, I. 1. 1, p. 33 (Amraoti ed.).

इत. श्री विक्रमादित्य. शास्त्यवन्ती नराधिपः ।
अनृणां पृथिवीकुर्वन प्रवर्तयतिवत्सरम् ॥
—*Prabhāvakacaritra*.

all these sources give almost identical chronological tables of the ruling dynasties of the post-Mahāvīra period, each one stating at the end that after 4 years' Śaka rule at Ujjayinī Vikrama was crowned in M.E. 470. Even in giving their own date some of the Jaina writers left no doubt as to the fact that the Vikrama era which they were using was the one which had started 470 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*.[1] And as they undoubtedly believed it to have started in 57 B.C. they had no doubt as to Mahāvīra's having died in 527 B.C.[2]

विक्कमरज्जारंभापुरओ सिरिवीर णिव्वुइ भणिया।
सुन्न-मुणि-वेय जुत्तो विक्कमकालाउ जिणकालो॥

—*Vicāraśreṇī.*

महमुक्खगमणाओ पालयनदचंदगुत्ताइराईसु वोलीणेसु।
चउसय सत्तरेंहिवासेहि विक्कमाइच्चो राया होही।

—Pāvāpurī-kalpa in the *Vividha Tīrtha-kalpa*.

[1] वरिसाण समुचउक्के सत्तरिजुत्तो जिणेद वीरस्स।
गिव्वाण उववण्णा विक्कमकालस्स उप्पत्ती॥
विक्कमणिवकालाओछाहत्तरदससं एसु वरिसाण।
माहम्मि सुद्ध पक्खे दसमी दिवसम्मि संतम्मि॥

—Colophon of *Jambucarita* by poet Vīra, dated V.E. 1076 (A.D. 1019), MS. dated A.D. 1459, preserved in the Āmer Bhaṇḍāra. Similarly, the author of *Māghanandi Śrāvakācāra*, a Kannada work on Jaina ethics, of A.D. 1253 gives the date of his work as Śaka 1175, mentioning that thi, Śaka era had started 605 years and five months after the *nirvāṇa*. Hs also mentions that the current year of the Mahāvīra era then wae 1780, that 1097 years had elapsed since the last of the Ācārāngas dhāris (i.e., since M.E. 683), and that 19220 years out of the 21000-years' period of Mahāvīra's Tīrtha (or of the fifth cycle) still remained. All this means that the Jainas in the 12th century also believed the *nirvāṇa* to have taken place in 527 B.C. (cf., K.B. Pathak, *IA*, XII, pp. 21-22).

[2] In fact, as Dr. Edward Thomas observed (*IA*, VIII, pp. 30-31), "The Jainas have a fixed and definite date for the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra, which is established by the concurrent testimony of their two sects, whose method of reckoning varies in itself, thereby

Another tradition which further confirms this date relates to the great schism in the Jaina Saṁgha. According to the Śvetāmbara sources the schism took place in M.E. 609 and according to the Digambara ones in V.E. 136, thus giving the date as A.D. 82 or 79.[1] The date of the redaction of the Śvetāmbara canon is another instance. Tradition places this event in M.E. 980 or 993 (i.e., A.D. 453 or 466) which seems to be quite correct since Bhadrabāhu III who wrote his Niryuktis on the redacted *Āgama-sūtras* was an elder brother of Varāhamihira, the astronomer (S.E. 427 or A.D. 505). *Tiloyapaṇṇati* gives the date of the commencement of the Earlier Śaka Era in M.E. 461 which, as we shall see, started in 66 B.C. This work as also the *Harivaṁśa* state that the Gupta rule commenced at the expiry of 242 years of Śaka rule, which gives us A.D. 320, which is exactly the date assigned to the beginning of the Gupta era.[2]

The earliest use in literature of the M.E. is found in the *Paum-cariu* of Vimalasūri who gives his date as M.E. 530 (or A.D. 3). The earliest use in inscriptions

---

securing, as it were, a double entry. The Śvetāmbaras date in the era of Vikrama, 57 B.C.; the Digambaras reckon by the Śaka Samvat, A.D. 78, and both arrive at the same figures of 526-7 B.C. for the death of Mahāvīra."

[1] छव्वास सयाइ नवुत्ताइ सिद्धिगयस्स वीरस्स।
तो बोडिआण दिट्ठी रहवीरपुरे समुप्पन्ना॥

—*Āvaśyaka Mūlabhāṣya*, v. 145 (A.D. 609).

छत्तीसे वारिससये विक्कमरायस्स मरणपत्तस्स।
सोरठे बलहीए उप्पण्णो सेवडो सघो॥

—*Darśanasāra* (A.D. 933).

[2] It is curious to note that Al-beruni gives this interval as 241 years. See K.B. Pathak's article in A.I.O.C., Poona, 1919, p. 133.

of this era is found in the Barli inscription of M.E. 84.[1] One of the Aśokan edicts which is assigned to the early part of that king's reign mentions the figure of 256 for which the possibility of being the year of some era, and probably the Buddha era, has already been entertained by some scholars.[2] It could equally well have been in the Mahāvīra era, i.e., M.E. 256 or 271 B.C., especially when there is reason to believe that Aśoka might have had Jaina leanings at least in the early part of his career.[3] And Khāravela, definitely a Jaina monarch, tells us in his inscription that the aqueduct which he brought into his capital in his 5th regnal year had originally been dug by a Nandarāja in the year 103[4], which seems to be in the M.E., thus giving us 424 B.C. for that Nanda king. The Jaina traditions place the rule of the Nandas from M.E. 60 to 210 or 215. So the Nandarāja of Khāravela's inscription might have been any one of these Nanda kings. In fact, on the basis of Purāṇic traditions, astronomical calculations and the Kalki or Saptarṣi era some scholars actually fix Nanda's accession in 424 B.C.[5]

No doubt, Hemacandra (12th century A.D.) has

---

[1] वीराय भगवते चतुरासीतिवसे (८४) काये जालामालिनिये रंनिविठ माझिमिके।

The Inscription was discovered by Pt. G.H. Ojha in 1912 in village Barli near Ajmer (cf., Sirkar, *Select Inscriptions*).

[2] Minor Rock Edict I, line 5. See J. Fleet, *JRAS*, 1910, pp. 1301-08; 1911, pp. 1091-1112.

[3] E. Thomas, 'Jainism, or the Early Faith of Asoka,' *JRAS*, IX, pp. 155 ff.

[4] Hāthīgumphā Insc., l. 6, : पंचमे च दानीवसे नदराजा तिवससत ओ(घा) टित, etc.

See *JBORS*, III, pt. 4, p. 455.

[5] cf., H.K. Deb, 'Date of Coronation of Mahāpadma Nanda,' *Summaries*, A.I.O.C. (Poona, 1919), pp. 120-123.

stated that Candragupta Maurya ascended the throne in M.E. 155, which fact has misled many modern scholars. But his is the solitary instance of that view, and is at variance with all other Jaina sources, Digambara or Śvetāmbara, earlier or later than himself, who give this date as M.E. 210 or 215.[1] Even Hemacandra elsewhere gives the traditional date and in another context has also admitted that the Nanda dynasty began in M.E. 60.[2] Merutuṅga (A.D. 1306) noticed this discrepancy but dared not openly refute Hemacandra's authority. However, he himself kept to the traditional dates, and did say at least this much, 'we do not know how and why Hemacandra has made such a unique statement —it requires consideration.' (तच्चिन्त्यम्.)[3]

The date of 527 B.C. does not affect even the Mauryan chronology as it is believed today. M.E. 210 or 215 (i.e., 317 or 312 B.C.) should be taken to mean the date of extension of the Mauryan rule over Ujjayinī in the reign of Candragupta Maurya. He must have certainly taken a few years to consolidate his position in Magadha before he launched on the career of expansion of his empire.[4]

---

[1] All the sources are unanimous on Nanda rule commencing in M.E. 60 and assign it 155 years, except one which assigns it 150 years. (See App. A, ii.)

[2] अनन्तर वर्धमान स्वामि निर्वाणवासरात् ।
गतायाषष्टिवत्सरयमिषनन्दोऽभवन्नृप : ॥ —*Pariśiṣṭaparva*, VI. 243.
Also see his *Triṣaṣṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-carita* (X. 12, vv. 45-46) where he gives the date of Kumārapāla's accession as M.E. 1669 (A. D. 1142).

[3] cf., *Vicāraśreṇī* in the *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga.

[4] In fact, an important Greek authority of *c.* 100 B.C., whom Prof. Tarn (in the *Greeks in Bactria and India*, pp. 44-50) describes as the 'Trogus Source,' actually gives the date of Candragupta's accession as 312 B.C. Prof. Tarn believes that this Greek historian must have learnt this fact from the Jainas themselves.

As regards Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru, the Jaina tradition has all along made the former, under the name of Śreṇika, a near relation, foremost royal disciple and the principal contemporary monarch of Mahāvīra. A Śvetāmbara tradition also states that Mahāvīra attained *nirvāṇa* in the 16th year of the reign of Ajātaśatru (Kuṇika). But in this period the eight years of his viceroyalty of Campā also seem to have been included.[1] Hence, if this king ascended the throne of Magadha in 535 B.C. this date will not be at variance even with the Buddhist tradition which places the Buddha's *nirvāṇa* in that king's 8th regnal year, for even if the Buddha's death (*parinirvāṇa*) is fixed in 483 B.C., his *nirvāṇa* or enlightenment (attainment of Bodhi) which had taken place 45 years earlier, coincides with the eighth year of Ajātaśatru's reign.

No doubt is entertained as to the Buddha's being a contemporary of Mahāvīra. And in the face of the specific statements of the Pāli texts that the Buddha survived Mahāvīra, that the former had always held the latter in high esteem, and that on one occasion, in the accounts of the contemporary Tīrthakas, the Buddha described Mahāvīra as 'passed middle age' (अद्धगतोवयो) and himself as only 'the newly initiated' (नब्वपबज्जित),[2] there is no reason why Mahāvīra should not be regarded to have been considerably senior, though a contemporary, to the Buddha. Moreover, the different Buddhist traditions place the date of

---

[1] The compilers of *An Advanced History of India*, p. 73, also seem to think so. Also see *Bhagavatī-sūtra*.

[2] एक समय भगवो सक्केसु विहरति तेनखोपनसमयेन निगण्ठो नातपुत्तो पावाय अधुना कालकतो होति। —*Sāmagāma-sutta* of *Majjhima-nikāya*; also see the *Upāli-sutta* of the same *Nikāya*, and the *Pāsādika-suttanta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya*; Rahula Sankrityayan, *Buddha-caryā*; *CHI* (1935), p. 156, *JRAS*, 1885, pp. 665 ff.

the Buddha differently; the Ceylonese in 544 B.C., the Burmese in 501 B.C., the Tibetan in 488 B.C. and the Cantonese in 486 B.C. (some scholars have suggested even 477 or 453 B.C.) and the recently fixed and now generally accepted date for that event is 483 B.C.[1] So whatever date from 544 B.C. to 483 B.C. or even a few years later be fixed for the death of the Buddha, the fact of his being a junior contemporary of Mahāvīra is not affected. Moreover, even after Mahāvīra, within the next 62 years flourished his three immediate successors, Gautama, Sudharmā and Jambu, who, one after the other, attained *kaivalya* and were like the master himself, Arhat Kevalins or Nigaṇṭha Tīrthakas. So the Buddha was not only a contemporary of Mahāvīra but of all these three Kevalins as well.

The date of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* is thus definitely fixed in 527 B.C., on its own merits, confirmed by internal as well as external evidence, and is in no way at variance with any known fact of history. There is no need to move it backwards or forwards even by a few years. There is absolutely no necessity of fixing it on the basis of shifting or not-quite-certain hypotheses and surmises.

The age of Mahāvīra at the time of his death is stated to have been 71 years, six months and seventeen days.[2] Dates of important events in his life, therefore, are :

Birth—Caitra Śukla 13, March 30, 599 B.C.

Renunciation—Mārgaśīrśa Kṛṣṇa 10, Nov. 11, 570 B.C.

Enlightenment—Vaiśākha Śukla 10, April 26, 557 B.C.

---

[1] Fixed by Geiger, Fleet, Wickremasinghe, etc. See *D.R. Bhandarkar Volume*, pp. 329-330.

[2] J.K. Mukhtar, *Bhagwān Mahāvīra aur Unka Samay* (Delhi, 1934). pp. 13, 31.

First Sermon—Śrāvaṇa Kṛṣṇa 1, August 1, 557 B.C.
Nirvāṇa—Kārttika Kṛṣṇa 15, Tuesday, Oct. 15, 527 B.C.[1]

[1] For the names of Indian days and months see Pūjyapāda's *Daśabhakti*, particularly the *Nirvāṇabhakti*, also *Dhavala*, *Jayadhavala*, etc. The corresponding dates in the Roman Calendar are based on Swami Kannu Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris*.

It may be noted here that the years in the Mahāvīra Nirvāna era denote the expired years and not the current ones as in the Christian era.

CHAPTER III

THE VIKRAMA ERA

THE Vikrama era is the most popular Indian era and it has been in use over the greater part of India, more particularly in the northern, western and central regions, for the past two thousand years or so. No other secular era appears to have enjoyed such a wide and long currency in this country.

A series of inscriptions, beginning from as far back as the 3rd century A.D., is available in this era, but it is only since the 10th century onwards that we find it being used under the name of Vikrama era. Prior to that it was generally used under other names, such as Kṛta, Mālava, Samvatsara, etc.

Thus from the year 282 to 481 some ten inscriptions have been discovered which use the name Kṛta Saṁvat.[1] The inscriptions of the year 461 and one of 481 use both Mālavagaṇa and Kṛta together to denote this era.[2] From this time onward down to the middle of the 10th century more than a dozen inscriptions have been found which mention the term Mālava or Mālavagaṇa only.[3] In this interval, too, we get two inscriptions, both of the year 770, which mention neither the term Kṛta nor Mālava, but designate the era simply by the word Saṁvatsara,[4] and another, that of the year 794, is the first epigraphic record to use the

[1] *EI*, XIX, nos. 1-5. Besides these, 3 from Badwā (Kota State) and 2 from Barnālā (Jaipur State) have been discovered.
[2] ibid., nos. 3 and 5. Also see *EI*, XII, pp. 315-21.
[3] *EI*, XIX; *IA*, XIII, p. 164; *ASI*, X, p. 32.
[4] *EI*, XIX, Appendix.

term Vikrama Saṁvatsara.[1] That of 898 also uses the words Vikramākhya Kāla.[2] With these exceptions all the other inscriptions dated in the years between 481 and 936 use the term Mālava alone, after which it was superseded by the term Vikrama Saṁvat. From 1028 down to the present day, with the exception of one of the year 1226, all the records use the term Vikrama only.[3] And from this time onwards it came to be the most used era in India. But in spite of these different names there is no doubt that it is the same era, the Kṛta and the Mālava eras having been proved to be identical with the Vikrama era.[4]

In literature its use began a little later and there it is never known to have been designated by any other name except that of Vikrama era. The *Paṭṭāvalis* of the Digambara Nandisaṁgha and Śvetāmbara Tapāgaccha, both belonging to about the 7th century A.D., and Haribhadra's *Āvaśyakavṛtti* (*c*. A.D. 775) seem to have been the first works to discuss the Vikrama era in connection with their own traditions relating to the date of Mahāvīra, and Vīrasena (A.D. 780) seems to have been the first author to give his date in this era.[5] Another work, the *Akalaṅka-carita*, of about the same time, gives the date of a past event in the Vikrama era.[6] A number of Jaina writers of the 10th and 11th centuries

---

[1] ibid.; also *IA*, XII, pp. 151 ff.

[2] *IA*, XIX, p. 35

[3] For this exception see *JBRAS*, Vol. LV, p. 48. The Insc. of 1028 is published in *JBBRAS*, XXII, p. 166.

[4] cf., Fleet, *CII*, III, Introd., p. 68; A.S. Altekar, 'Vikrama Samvatsara', *Sahyadri* (Marathi), Oct. 1943, p. 695; D.R. Bhandarkar, 'The Vikrama Era', *Sir R.G. Bhandarkar Volume*, 1947, pp. 193-94, *IA*, 1932, pp. 101-103, etc.

[5] cf., *Anekānta*, VII. 7-8, pp. 207-214.

[6] *EC*, II, Introd.

give their dates in this era.[1] Thence onwards it almost became a universal practice.

We have seen that the Jaina tradition places the commencement of this era in M.E. 470 and that later Jaina writers in using this era had also no doubt on this point. They also were certain as to its having started 135 years before the commencement of the popular Śaka era. The Jaina sources which discuss the date of Mahāvīra in terms of the Śaka era invariably give the date of the latter's commencement as M.E. 605. Merutuṅga specifically states the difference between the Vikrama and the Śaka eras as 135 years,[2] and he is supported by Al-beruni[3] as also by an inscription of the 11th century A.D. and another, still earlier, of the 9th century A.D. which use both the Vikrama and Śaka eras simultaneously.[4]

The fact that Mahāvīra died in 527 B.C., a number of synchronisms with other eras and known facts of history, the popular belief which dates back to more than a thousand years, the different traditions and the absence of any definite evidence to the contrary, all together unequivocally fix the starting point of this era in 57 B.C.

As to the different designations under which this

---

[1] For example Devasena (V.E. 990), Dhanapāla (V.E. 1029), Amitagati (V.E. 1050, 1070), Vīra (V.E. 1076).

[2] His *Vicāraśreni* in the *Prabandha-cintāmani*, S.J.G., Bombay.

[3] *Alberuni's India*, ed. Sachau (London, 1914), Ch. II, p. 49.

[4] एकादश शतवर्षांक तदधिकषोडशच (११११६) विक्रमेद्रेश।
नवसत एकासीति (६८१) सकगत शालिवाहन च नृपघीस॥

—*EI*, XIX, p. 22—Inscriptions of N. India, no. 134. And the Deogarha Jaina Pillar Insc. of A.D. 862

सवत ६१६ .शककाल सप्तशतानिचतुरशीत्यधिकानि, ७८४.

—*EI*, IV, no. 44, pp. 309-310.

era has been known a lot of discussion has taken place and all sorts of theories have been advanced. But there is little doubt that the designations Mālava and Vikrama derive their names from the Mālava people and their illustrious leader restectively. The term Kṛta, however, has remained a veritable puzzle. The epithet Sananda to be added before the term Vikrama era has only been suggested to distinguish it from some Ananda Vikrama era which, as we have already seen, has no foundation, and we need not consider it. But the other three names require an explanation which would be clear if we knew to what event or to which person this era owes its origin.

Popular belief and later tradition attribute this era to King Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, who figures in folklore and mediaeval literature as a great hero, a very noble and generous hearted king and a great patron of art and learning, whose court was adorned by nine intellectual gems. A mass of legend has developed around his name, and in these tales he has often been confused with one or the other of his later namesakes, particularly with Candragupta II Vikramāditya (A.D. 379-413) who offers a parallel in many respects.

We cannot say much about the origin of the term Vikramāditya except that it means 'Sun of Valour' and came to be regarded as a title of great distinction among ancient Indian kings.[1] The word Vikramaṇa is known to occur in the Vedic literature and in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* while the *Purāṇas* have used the word Trivikrama for Viṣṇu. The Nasik epitaph of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi is the first known epigraphic record which mentions the

[1] There were several Vikramādityas among the Guptas, the Cālukyas, the Hoysalas, etc.

word Vikrama[1], and Hāla's *Satasai* is perhaps the first literary work which speaks of Vikramāditya's generosity.[2] From the 4th century onwards it also begins to appear as a title on royal seals and coins. The founder of this era, therefore, seems to have been the first Indian prince to have this name or title. Most probably it was his first name which was used by later kings and rulers simply as a title.

Scholars have, however, failed to identify or establish the historicity of the original Vikrama. Brahmanical and Buddhist accounts seem to have referred to no such person in the 1st century B.C.; no coins, inscriptions or any other historical evidence seem to prove his existence; most of the scholars included in the list of the celebrated Nine Gems are known to have lived in much later times; a number of later Vikramādityas are known to have been associated with Malwa and Ujjayinī; and some of them are even reputed to have freed the country from the onslaughts of the alien Śakas or Hūnas.

Hence a number of theories have been put forward as regards the origin of this era. Marshall attributed it to the Parthian king Azes I [3], Fleet to Kaniṣka[4], D.R. Bhandarkar to Puṣyamitra Śuṅga[5], Jayaswal to Gautamiputra or his successor Puḷumāyi Sātakarṇi[6], Smith, Fergusson and R. G. Bhandarkar to Candragupta II[7],

---

1 वरवारणविकम चारु विकम

—*EI*, VIII, no. 2, l. 4.

2 *EI*, XII, p. 320.

3 *JRAS*, 1932, p. 149.

4 cf., *JBORS*, II, pt. 4, p. 490; also *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 913 ff.

5 *IA*, Vol. 61, pp. 101-103.

6 *JBORS*, XVI (1930), pt. 3-4, p. 251; also *JSS*, I. 4, p. 208.

7 Smith, *Early History of India*.

and Kielhorn and Hoernle to Yaśodharman of Malwa.[1] Some scholars have suggested that Kṛta was the actual name of the founder of this era, others that it was called so because it inaugurated the Happy Age or 'Kṛtayuga,' or because it meant 'made, effected or redundant,' or because it was connected with the Ki-li-to people mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, or with the Kaṭha tribe, and so on.[2] It has also been suggested that the era seems to denote some important victory of the Mālava people and also that the Mālavas were not its founders but that they seem to have adopted it.[3]

Most of these theories have been found defective and some of them quite untenable. No single view has yet been found to be quite satisfactory and acceptable even by the majority. It will not be out of place, therefore, to see how far the Jaina sources and traditions help us in this direction.

The *Kālakācārya Kathānaka* which is related in the *Kalpasūtra* (*circa* 5th century A.D.) and which has been repeated or alluded to in a number of later works, seems to hold the key to this problem.[4] The story tells us that towards the middle of the 1st century B.C. Gardabhilla ruled over Ujjayinī. In his times there lived a Jaina saint by name Kālaka the second, who is said to have been the guru of the kings of Pratiṣṭhānapura. He had a beautiful sister by name Sarasvatī who was a

[1] Kielhorn, *IA*, XIX, p. 35; XX, pp. 403-4, Hoernle, *JRAS*, 1909, pp. 89 ff.

[2] Prof. K.B. Vyas, 'The Kṛta Era', *PIHC* (Bombay, 1947), pp. 151-159.

[3] K.B. Vyas, op. cit., also *IA*, XLII, 1913, p. 163.

[4] See W.N. Brown's translation, *The Story of Kālaka*, (Washington, 1933); also the *Kālakācārya Kathānaka-saṁgraha*, S.J.G., Bombay; Jacobi; *Das Kālakācārya Kathānakam*, *ZDMG*, XXXIV, pp. 247 ff.

nun. The king of Ujjayinī, who was a licentious brute, lost his head at the maidenly beauty of the nun and detained her in his palace.[1] Kālaka tried his best to dissuade the king from his evil designs, but failed. He tried to arouse public opinion against the sacrilege attempted by the tyrant, but it was of no avail. He approached nobles and higher officials as also some neighbouring princes to intercede on his behalf, but none dared to oppose the tyrant. Thus frustrated, Kālaka went to the country of Sagakula which lay on the banks of the Indus and of which the rulers were called the Sāhis.[2] Kālaka was a great astrologer and he soon won the favour of the Sāhi and stayed at his court as an honoured guest. One day a messenger brought to the Sāhi a cup, a dagger and a letter, on seeing which the latter paled with fear. Kālaka was surprised and asked the reason. The Sāhi told him that his overlord, the Sāhānusāhi, who was an old man, was somehow displeased with him and had commanded him to cut his own head with the dagger sent to him. The head was to be placed in the bowl and forwarded to the Sāhānusāhi. The refusal to obey orders was to be punished by the total destruction of the Sāhi's family. He was also told that similar messages had been received by a number of other Sāhis as well. Kālaka saw his opportunity and persuaded the Sāhi to invite

---

[1] कालयसूरि लहुयभगिणी सरस्सई नाम साहुणी, वियारभूमीए निग्गया समाणीदिट्ठा, उज्जेणीनयरि सामिणा गद्दभिल्लराइणा अज्भोववन्नेण य।

—*Kālak. Kathā.*, p. 38.

[2] अहसूरि सगकुले वच्चइ, इगसाहिणो समीवम्मि ।

—The Prakrit versions have the words 'Sagakula' and 'Sāhis' and the Sanskrit versions 'Sākhis' instead. [See also *IA*, XLIII (1914), p. 125]. They were called Śakas because they came from Sagakula—

सगकुलाओ जेण समागया तेण ते सगाजाया ।

all such other Sāhis and accompany him to Malwa where after the annihilation of the tyrant Gardabhilla they would be rewarded with a rich kingdom. At this the Sāhis, who were 96 in number, fell for this opportune escape from the terrible fate that awaited them there, and marched with their forces towards Malwa. They crossed the Indus and came to Surāṣṭra and encamped near Ḍhakkagiri, as the rainy season had arrived.[1] Then they entered Lāṭadeśa, took with them the kings of that country and invaded Malwa. On reaching the outskirts of Ujjayinī, Kālaka sent an ultimatum to Gardabhilla to release Sarasvatī at once, failing which he would be totally destroyed.[2] Gardabhilla did not relent. Kālaka, therefore, bade the Sāhis to besiege the city and helped them in overcoming the magic of Gardabhilla. Eventually the latter was defeated and expelled from the country.

Against the intentions and expectations of even Kālaka himself, the Śakas settled in Ujjayinī and continued occupation for several years more. The Mālava people rose against the intruders and led by their valiant leader Vikramāditya, the heroic son of Gardabhilla himself, they ousted the Śakas from the homeland.[3] This national victory was celebrated with great eclat and to commemorate this event an era was started.[4] A number

---

[1] उत्तरिओ सिधुनई कमेण सोरठ मडल पत्तो,
ते ढक्कगिरि समीवे ठियादिणेकहविमतवसा।
—ibid.

[2] हूयमह पेसइ गुरु, अज्जवि नरनाह सरसईमुंच,
अह ताणिय हि तुट्टइ फुट्टइज्जदेव ! अइभरिय।
—ibid.

[3] कालातरेण केणाइ उप्पादिट्ठा सगाण त वसम्।
जावो मालवराया नामेण विक्कमाइच्चो॥
—*Kālak. Kathā.*, p. 43.

[4] नियवोसवच्छरोजेण
—ibid.

of Jaina sources assign this event to 57 B.C. Some of them further inform us that the Śakas once again rose to power, exterminated the line of Vikramāditya and a second time occupied Ujjayinī. In order to celebrate this reconquest and to supersede the era of the Mālavas they started a new era of their own, i.e., the Śaka era of A.D. 78.[1] Some Jaina works mention the name of Vikramāditya's father as Gandharvasena Mahendrāditya and his dynasty as Gardabhilla, Kharabhilla, Gardabha, Rāsabha, etc. Some scholars are of opinion that it might have been a branch of the Khāravela dynasty of Kaliṅga.[2] Jaina works fix the date of Gardabhilla in M.E. 453-466 (i.e., 74-61 B.C.) and state that after him the Śakas ruled for 4 years and then came Vikrama in M.E. 470 (or 57 B.C.)[3], whereas the *Tiloyapaṇṇati* places this first Śaka occupation of Ujjayinī in M.E. 461 (or 66 B.C.).[4] The Kālakācārya of Vikrama tradition was the second of the three Jaina gurus of that name and is assigned to M.E. 453 (or 74 B.C.). The Śaka chief or the Śāhi who occupied Ujjayinī at his instance was probably the first Kṣaharāta, a predecessor of Nahapāna, and the Sāhānusāhi referred to was the Śaka overlord of Śakasthāna or Śakakula, probably a predecessor of Maues. The Śakas had already entered India and settled in Sindh, and this Indian settlement of theirs was known

---

[1] एय पासगिय समक्खाय सगकाल जाणणत्थ

Kālakācārya episode in the *Prabhāvaka-carita* of Prabhā Candra Sūri (A.D. 1276). Of the many Prakrit and Sanskrit versions of the story of Kālaka, this is the most fuller and popular one. Also see *The Age of Imperial Unity*, Bombay, 1951, p. 155.

[2] cf., H.C. Seth's article in Nagpur University Journal, no. 8; and *JA*, XI, 1, pp. 4-5.

[3] cf., *Abhidhāna Rājendra*, Pt. V, p. 1289; *Tīrthoddhāra-prakaraṇa*, *Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvali*, *pariśiṣṭa-parva*, Merutunga's *Therāvali*, etc.

[4] vv. 1496, 1501, 1503.

as Śakasthāna or Śakakula. The Śaka Sāhis were merely some of the many neighbouring princes, who alone agreed to help the monk in chastising a bad king and in exterminating his unjust and tyrannical rule. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri observes that 'there is nothing improbable in this story which may well represent an episode in the historic struggle between the Āndhras and the Śakas.'[1] Dr. Sten Konow lays great stress on the Kālaka tradition and accepts the defeat of a Śaka ruler of Ujjayinī at the hands of a Vikrama in 57 B.C. and Jayaswal has no doubt that it records a genuine historical tradition.[2] The fact that the Śakas had invaded India and had conquered a part of it at least once more before it was again conquered by them towards the middle of the 1st century A.D. is also confirmed by contemporary Chinese chronicles which use the word 'again' or 'the second time' in connection with this later Śaka inroad, and which in Prof. Halgrain's opinion affords no other interpretation than that there must have been an earlier Śaka conquest. It is evident that in the beginning of the 2nd century A.D. this earlier conquest of India was well known even in far off China.[3]

From the Greek records we know that in Alexander's times the Mālavas were one of the several tribes living in the Indus valley. Pressed hard by foreign inroads the Mālava tribe seems to have migrated to Rajputana and thence to the Ujjayinī region where it finally settled down and gave the country the name of

---

[1] *History of India*, Part I, p. 108.

[2] *CII*, Volume II, pt. I, *JBORS*, XVI, p. 233; for views of other scholars, see *CHI* (1935), pt. I, pp. 167-8, *PHAI* (1950), p. 33; *IA*, XLIII, p. 125.

[3] See Satyaśrāva, *Śakas in India* (Lahore, 1942); *CHI*, I, p. 583; *PHAI* (1950), pp. 458-473; *IA*, XXXV, pp. 33-47.

Malwa. Towards the middle of the 1st century B.C., Gardabhilla, who probably belonged to Khāravela's lineage, seems to have become the leader and political head of these Mālavas of Ujjayinī. But his evil ways not only brought about his own ruin but also threw the country under alien domination from which their hero Vikrama delivered them. The Mālavas were a freedom-loving republican tribe and they commemorated this national achievement in their coins and seals which bear the legends *Mālavānaṁ-Jayaḥ* or *Mālava-gaṇasya-Jayaḥ* in ancient Brāhmi script and have been discovered in Malwa and Rajasthan.[1] With the same purpose they also started an era, but it is curious why they did not designate it as the Mālava or Mālavagaṇa era and instead continued to call it the Kṛta era for several centuries.

The explanation is simple. The Mahāvīra era which might have been current in those regions and in those times was a Kṛta era since it commences from the first moon day of the Indian month of Kārttika.[2] Incidentally the earlier Śaka era (of 66 B.C.) was also a Kṛta era since it is said to have been started exactly 461 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*, or it might be that these early Śakas adopted the current Kṛta era (i.e.,

[1] *PIHC* (1947), p. 158. Some of such coins have been assigned to 1st century B.C.

[2] Kṛta can be a derivative of Kārttika or Kṛttikā. Just as an era commencing in Caitra may be called a Caitrī era, one commencing in Śrāvana a Śrāvaṇī era, in Vaiśākha a Vaiśākhī era, so an era commencing in Kārttika may appropriately be designated as a Kṛta era. It may also be noted in this connection that the Vikrama era as prevalent in Surāṣṭra and the South still commences on Kārttika Śukla Pratipadā, just like the Mahāvīra Era. This Kārtikādi Vikrama era is commonly called the Southern Vikrama era to distinguish it from the Caitrādi V.E. which is called the Northern V.E. (see Fleet, *IA*, XVIII, p. 93; and Kielhorn, op. cit., p. 251; XIX, p. 21).

the Mahāvīra era) and only began their reckoning from the year of their victory. The same thing seems to have been done by the Mālava people. It is also confirmed by the fact that the commencement of the Vikrama era is also placed exactly 470 years after the *nirvāṇa*, whereas the Śaka era (i.e., of A.D. 78) which started from the first moon day of the month of Caitra, is placed 605 years and 5 months after the *nirvāṇa*. Moreover, some of the early inscriptions in this Vikrama or Mālava era also leave no doubt as to its having been adopted by the Mālavas from an older tradition generally termed as the Kṛta reckoning.[1] Hence the era continued under the name of Kṛta up to the beginning of the 5th century A.D. From that time onwards, however, an attempt to revive the memory of the Mālava people about their past glory and national achievements seems to have been made. Hence the name of the era was changed from Kṛta to Mālava. At about the same time, in order to reconcile this era with other current eras like the Śaka, the Kalacuri or the Cedī, the Gupta or the Valabhī, which seem to have commenced their reckonings from the month of Caitra, this era also seems to have been made to begin its reckoning from that month, at least in the north. Hence there was no sense in calling it by the name of Kṛta any longer. By the 8th century the Mālavagaṇa as a separate entity seems to have become non-existent. It

[1] For example, the Mandasor Insc. of Narayarman of the year 461 uses the words श्री मालवगणाम्नाते प्रशस्ते कृतसंज्ञिते and as D.R. Bhandarkar surmises, the Mālavas had nothing to do with the actual foundation of the era, as the phrase मालवगणाम्नात (i.e., handed down traditionally, not originated, amongst the Mālavas) indicates. It shows merely that the Mālavas were in possession of a traditional mode of reckoning years, known as Kṛta (cf., *IA*, XLII, 1913, p. 163; also *EI*, XII, p. 320).

was now the age of kings and not of people. Traditions must have, therefore, been unearthed to discover the name of that hero who was the founder of this era; and the people of these times could not but think that he must have been a great king. The gradual change from Mālavagaṇa to Mālavavaṁśa-kīrtti, then to Mālaveśa and finally to Vikrama or king Vikramāditya in the inscriptions from the 8th to the 10th century themselves speak of this change in outlook.[1] Tradition had supplied the name of the founder as Vikrama, and it was not a new name. So many important monarchs of the north and the south had made the name quite popular by adopting it as their title of distinction. Henceforward it was the only name, excepting in one or two cases, under which this era came to be used.

But about this time (10th century), too, some misunderstanding was created mostly by the Jaina writers themselves, about the event in Vikrama's life which was made the occasion for the commencement of this era. Some hinted that it was his birth[2], others stated that it was his coronation[3] and still others implied that it was his death.[4] These last seem to have been misled by the impression that like the Mahāvīra *nirvāṇa* era

[1] Inscs. of years 493 and 589 use मालवगण, those of 524 and 529 use मालववंशकीर्त्ते, that of 795 uses मालवेशाना, of 794 the word विक्रमसंवत्, of 898 विक्रमाख्यकाल and of 1028 विक्रमनृपकाल, etc. (*EI*, XIX, App.; *IA*, XIX and XX.)

[2] Prakrit *Paṭṭāvali* of Nandi Saṁgha, op. cit.; also see *Vasunandi Śrāvakācāra*, Banaras (1952).

[3] Merutunga's *Therāvali*, *Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvali*, *Vividha Tīrtha-kalpa*, *Prabhāvaka-carita*, etc.

[4] Devasena (विक्कमरायस्स मरणपत्तस्स, etc.), Vāmadeva (मृते विक्रमराजनि, etc.), Amitagati (विक्रमपार्थिवस्य or समारूढे पूत), Ratnanandi (मृते विक्रमभूपाले). Some non-Jaina inscriptions also use such words as श्री विक्रमनृपकालातीत, विक्रमराज्य समयातीत, विक्रमतिक्रमात्, etc. See *Śakas in India* by Satyaśrāva, p. 46.

and other religious eras, all ancient eras must have started from the death of some great person. What actually was the case we have already seen. The victory over and consequent expulsion of the alien Śakas from Malwa by the Mālava people under the leadership of Vikramāditya was this great event which might well have coincided with the assumption by Vikrama of supreme political authority over the republic in the same year, i.e., M.E. 470 or 57 B.C.

CHAPTER IV

THE SAKA ERA

THE only popular and current Saka era, often designated in the Pañcāṅgas as the Saka Sālivāhana, is later than the Vikrama era by 135 years. And as we have already seen, Indians have been believing it to be as such for more than one thousand years. Since the Jaina sources unanimously fix its commencement 605 years and 5 months after the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra which took place in 527 B.C., the starting point of the Saka era naturally falls in A.D. 78, which fact is also confirmed by its present reckoning. The Saka era enjoyed almost universal popularity over the whole of the Peninsula, and from there it even reached the Indian colonies and Indianised kingdoms of South-east Asia.[1] If the Vikrama era came to be the most commonly used era in northern and western India, the Saka era occupied the foremost place in South Indian reckonings. Numerous synchronisms of the available dates in these two eras as also with other known facts and dates unequivocally support its date of origin as being A.D. 78.

Although we begin to get its use from the very first year of its inception we do not find it mentioned under its proper name for some three centuries or so. Sarvanandi's *Lokavibhāga*, a Prakrit Jaina work on cosmology, completed in S.E. 380 in the reign of Pallava Simhavarman of Kāñcī, seems to have been the first

[1] See Dr. B.R. Chatterjee, *Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia* (Calcutta, 1928).

example in literature to use this era and under its proper name too.[1] From the 6th century of the era onwards, however, we begin to get numerous examples of its use by Jaina writers and also by some Brahmanical writers, particularly the astronomers. As regards epigraphy, the western Kshatrapas of Surāṣṭra, the western Cālukyas of Bādāmī, the Gaṅgas of Talkāḍ, the Pallavas of Kāñcī, the Kadambas of Banavāsi, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheṭa and all the later ruling dynasties, big and small, of the South, till and even after the middle ages, in their numerous inscriptions engraved in stone or on copperplate grants, are found making use of this era. The result of such a wide currency was that the term Śaka came to be synonymous with the word era. Expressions like Vikrama Śaka (Vikramāṅka or Vikramārka Śaka), Hijri Śaka, Christian Śaka (or Khriṣṭi Śaka), etc., are not wanting. This fact also gave rise to some confusion, especially between the Vikrama and the Śaka eras. Examples of the one being used under the name of the other have been known.[2] Some mediaeval writers seem to have even believed that Vikrama was the name of the Śaka king who founded the era.[3]

In early inscriptions from Taxila, Mathura, etc., this era is designated simply as Saṁvatsara or Saṁvat, in those of Surāṣṭra as Varṣe, and in later centuries differently as Śaka, Śake, Śakanṛpa-saṁvatsara, Śaka-nṛpati-saṁvatsara, Śaka-nṛpati-rājyābhiṣeka-saṁvatsara,

[1] Yativṛsabha (*c.* A.D. 176) is the first Jaina writer to discuss this era in his *Tiloyapannati.*

[2] See *Śakas in India*, pp. 36-37.

[3] cf., Mādhavacandra's commentary on *Trilokasāra*. He interprets the term as Vikramāṅkaśaka and his Hindi commentator Toḍarmall as 'the Śaka king of the name of Vikrama.'

Śaka-nṛpa-kālātīta-saṁvatsara, Śakendra-kāla, Śaka-kāla-saṁvatsara, Śaka-samaye, Śakābda, Śakābde, Śaka-saṁvat, Śaka-Śālivāhana, Śālivāhana-nirṇīta-śaka-varṣa, and so on.[1] At present it is generally used as Śaka-Śālivāhana.

Several theories have been put forward as regards the origin of this era. Majority of modern scholars attribute it to Kaniṣka. The inscriptions of this king and of his several successors range from year 1 to 98, and they designate the year simply Saṁvat, Saṁvatsara or Rājya-samvatsara.[2] Kaniṣka is generally believed to have ascended the throne in A.D. 78.[3] But there are some who are inclined to assign to him a later date, such as A.D. 129[4], and a few who take him to earlier times and try to identify him with the founder of the Vikrama era.[5]

Prof. Rapson is the chief exponent of the theory that Kaniṣka was the founder of this era. He says, "The dates which appear on the coins and inscriptions of its (Śaka) princes are all in the era which starts from the beginning of Kaniṣka's reign in A.D. 78. They range from the year 41 to 310 (i.e., A.D. 119-388) and form the most continuous and complete chronological series found on monuments of ancient India. It was in consequence of its long use by Śaka princes of western India that the era became generally known in India as the Śaka era."[6]

The theory though plausible has several defects.

---

[1] Fleet, *IA*, XII, pp. 207-215.
[2] See Appendix to *EI*, Vol. X (Northern Inscriptions).
[3] *CHI*, Vol. I, p. 583.
[4] Sten Konow, *CII*, Vol. II, pt. I, p. 68. He attributes the era of A.D. 78 to Wima Kadphises, the predecessor of Kaniṣka.
[5] For example Fleet, See *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 994-98.
[6] *CHI*, Vol. I, p. 585.

First of all, it is based on a general assumption that all the Śaka kings used this era in their inscriptions wherever found. It ignores the fact that the Śakas had come to and settled in different parts of India more than a century before Kaniṣka's time. Hence the records of these early Śaka chiefs, of the Śaka Satraps of Taxila, Mathura, Varanasi, Surāṣṭra, etc., could not have been dated in the era of Kaniska. Secondly, the Kuṣaṇas were not exactly Śakas; they were rather Tukharians. Only if the term Śaka is used very loosely they may be designated as such. Still the fact remains that they belonged to a much later branch of the Śaka people who had been coming to India for the past 150 years or so. Thirdly, though the Kuṣaṇa empire of Kaniṣka stretched from Afghanistan to Mathura, probably as far as Varanasi, the greater part even of northern India was beyond his sway. The Kuṣaṇas certainly had no authority over western and southern India, and it was in these regions where the Śaka era has been most popular. Lastly, Kaniṣka and his successors used the word 'Saṁvatsara' or 'Rājya-saṁvatsara' when the earlier Śakas and those of western India used the word 'Varṣe' to denote the date year. Several modern scholars also do not give credit to Rapson's theory. M. Winternitz observes, "The view still maintained by a few scholars that Kaniṣka is the founder of the Śaka era which began in A.D. 78, is less likely to be correct[1]" and Sten Konow argues that "Wima Kadphises was on the throne long after the beginning of the Śaka era which cannot accordingly have been started by Kaniṣka, his successor."[2]

---

[1] *History of Indian Literature*, Volume II, p. 611.
[2] *CII*, II, i. p. 68.

Among earlier authorities, Al-beruni (A.D. 1030) gives a different theory. He says, "Śaka kāla, the epoch of the era of Śaka, falls 135 years later than Vikrama. The Śaka mentioned here tyrannised the country between the river Sindh and the ocean after he had made Āryāvarta his dwelling place. He interdicted the Hindus from considering and representing themselves as anything but Śakas. The Hindus had much to suffer from him, till at last they received help from east, when Vikramāditya marched against him, put him to flight and killed him in the region of Karur between Multan and the castle of Loni. Now this date became famous as people rejoiced in the news of the death of the tyrant, and was used as the epoch of an era, especially by the astronomers. They honour the conqueror by adding Śri to his name so as to say Śri Vikramāditya. Since there is a long interval between the era which is called the era of Vikrama and the killing of the Śaka, we think that that Vikrama from whom the era has got its name is not identical with that one who killed the Śaka, but only a namesake of his."[1]

It is obvious that Al-beruni has confused several different traditions, namely those relating to the original Vikrama of 57 B.C., those concerning Candragupta II Vikramāditya (A.D. 379—413) who is also reputed to have extirpated the Śakas and those relating to the annihilation of the savage Hūṇas at the hands of Skandagupta Kramāditya (A.D. 455—467) or Yaśodharman of Malwa (A.D. 532), probably at the battle of Karur. In this account of the tyrant Śaka we also hear an echo of the Jaina tradition about the Kalki who is said to

[1] *Alberuni's India*, ed. E.C. Sachau (London, 1914), Vol. II, p. 49.

have risen about one thousand years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. Nevertheless, Al-beruni is quite right as regards the names of and the interval between the Vikrama and the Śaka eras as also in confirming their respective dates as 57 B.C. and A.D. 78.

But Al-beruni was not the only one to believe that the Śaka era started at the defeat and death of a Śaka king at the hands of Vikramāditya. Some Indian writers of early mediaeval times also seem to have had a similar belief, which probably constituted the basis of Al-beruni's statement.[1] And their ultimate source seems to be Brahmagupta the astronomer (A.D. 628) who uses such expressions as शकान्तेऽब्दाः or शकनृपान्ते in stating the fact that 'at the end of the Śakas 3179 years of the Kali age had elapsed.'[2] But the term may also mean 'up to the time of the Śakas'; at least in telling his own date he does not use the suffix अन्ते and simply says 'when 550 years of the Śaka king had elapsed he completed his work.'[3] But Bhāskara (*c.* A.D. 900), Udayana (A.D. 984), etc., modified Brahmagupta's शकान्तेऽब्दा into शकनृपस्यान्ते .[4] Among the Jainas, Somadeva (A.D. 959) seems to have

---

[1] 'शकानाम्म्लेच्छाराजानस्ते यस्मिनकाले विक्रमादित्येन व्यापादित स शकसम्बधीकाल शाकइत्युच्यते'—वासनाभाष्यटीका—खडखाण्ड्यक (Calcutta ed., 1925, p. 2) of Āmarāja (A.D. 1180); also see commentary of Pṛthudaka Svāmi (*c.* A.D. 864) on the same (Calcutta, 1941, p. 3) and Bhatta Utpala's comm. on verse VIII. 20 of *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* of Varāhamihira.

[2] 'त्रीणि कृतादीनिकलेर्गोऽगेक गुणा. शकान्तेऽब्दा.'

—*Brahma-sphuta-siddhānta*, I. v. 26, also 27.

[3] 'शकनृपाणा पञ्चशत सयुक्तैवर्षं शतेः पञ्चभिरतीतै.'

—ibid.

[4] cf., *Śakas in India*, op. cit., pp. 42-44.

been the first writer to use a similar expression, i.e., शकनृपकालातीत सम्वत्सर.[1] But as D. C. Sircar points out, this term does not necessarily mean that the era started at the death of the Śaka, but that it may equally well denote the expired years of the Śaka as against the regnal years.[2] In fact, no earlier record or tradition supports this theory. Varāhamihira (A.D. 505) uses the word शकेन्द्रकाल and is followed by Baṭeśvara (A.D. 780) in this respect.[3] An inscription of S.E. 435 calls the era as शकनृपति सवत्सर[4], whereas another of S. E. 500 calls it as शकनृपतिराज्याभिषेक सवत्सर (the era of the Śaka king's coronation).[5] We have already seen that the Jaina tradition almost unanimously marks the commencement of this era from the time the Śakas (or the Śaka king) came into power. It leaves no doubt as to the fact that the Śakas once more regained power, conquered Malwa a second time and to supersede the era of Vikrama started their own era; and one of the sources specifically mentions that the object of the above remark is to give information about the origin of the popular Śaka era.[6]

Hence the theory that this Śaka era started at the death of a Śaka king has no force. It cannot also be attributed to some Vikramāditya because no Indian king nor any Śaka chief or ruler bearing this name or title is known to have lived in the last quarter of the 1st century A.D.

The term Śālivāhana is found associated with the

---

[1] See colophon of *Yaśastilaka-campū* (Kāvyamālā, Bombay).

[2] *PIHC*, Lahore, p. 53.

[3] *Pañca-siddhāntikā*, p. 31, v. 2 (Lahore ed); *Bṛhat-saṃhitā*, VIII. 20.

[4] *IA*, VI, p. 73.

[5] *EI*, VII, App. p. 2, no. 3.

[6] See footnote on p. 63 ante; also footnote 1, 2 & 3 on pp. 46 and 47 ante.

Saka era only after the 11th century A.D. An inscription of A.D. 1059 seems to be the first to mention the name of Śālivāhana together with this era.[1] No earlier tradition or literary or epigraphic evidence supports this view. Some scholars have tried to suggest that this Śālivāhana seems to be a Sātavāhana ruler and probably identical with Hāla, the author of the Prakrit *Gāthā Saptaśatī*.[2] But they have nothing but mere conjecture to base this theory upon. No Sātavāhana ruler is known to have had the name of Śālivāhana and the historicity or date of the author of the *Satasai* is uncertain and obscure. The Sātavāhanas of Paiṭhan were, no doubt, serious rivals for power of the Saka Ksaharātas (Nahapāna, Uṣavadāta, etc.) and of the western Kṣtrapas of Casṭana's line. Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi is believed to have waged wars with Nahapāna and fought them fiercely, and Vāśiṣṭhiputra Puḷumāyi with Casṭana and Rudradāman. It is quite likely that the chief bone of contention was Ujjayinī. Each of these two powers tried to possess and keep in hand this great capital, and sometimes victory fell to the one, sometimes to the other. A.D. 78 was certainly a fateful year in the fortunes of this city, and might well have marked a partial victory of the Sātavāhanas. The rulers of this line seem to have been adepts in appropriating to themselves the honour belonging to their adversaries; Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi is known to have adopted the coins of Nahapāna after defeating him.[3] An inscription of S. E. 1389 curiously

[1] 'नवसत एकासीति सकगत शालिवाहन च नृपघीस'
—*EI*, XIX, p. 22; Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 134.

[2] Muniśvara in his *Siddhānta-sārvabhauma*, Pt. I, p. 23, (Banaras edn.).

[3] See the Nasik Epitaph of Gautamiputra Śri Śātakarṇi, also see *PIHC*, Nagpur, 1950, pp. 38-39.

describes this era as शालिवाहन निर्णीत शकवर्ष क्रमागते[1] which obviously indicates that Sālivāhana did some manipulation with the Śaka era. There might be some truth in it, and some tradition to this effect might have all along been in existence. But the fact remains that not much earlier evidence in support has yet been available and the Sātavāhanas are known to have used no era in their inscriptions and coins. They have only the regnal years of individual kings of that dynasty inscribed on them.

From the foregoing discussion the following facts emerge: that the popular Śaka era commenced in A.D. 78; that it is associated in its origin with Ujjayinī; that it is a secular, not a religious, era and like most secular eras must have commenced with the coronation, victory or beginning of the rule of some important king, probably in Ujjayinī; that this king was an important Śaka chief or ruler; that his name was not Vikramāditya, and that Kaniṣka, the Kuṣāna monarch of north-west India, or any contemporary Sātavāhana king or any other Indian ruler had, if at all, little to do with the foundation of this era.[2] But the question as to who then was its founder still remains unsolved. Here again the Jaina sources seem to prove more helpful.

The *Tiloyapaṇṇati* (originally written in A.D. 176) specifically mentions that the rule of the Gandharvas or Gardabhillas lasted for 100 years, which was succeed-

---

[1]Somalpuram Grant of Virūpākṣa—*EI*, XVII, p. 199.

[2] Jayaswal says: 'The era of A.D. 78 is connected in Indian tradition with Ujjain' (*JBORS*, XVI, pt. 3-4, p. 232); R.D. Banerji: 'The Śaka era originated in Western India' (*IA*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 51); Prof. Tarn: 'The Śaka era of A.D. 78 was also a Mālva era and was instituted by the Western (Saca) satraps, to commemorate their independence and their retaking of Ujjain' (*Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 335).

ed by 40-year rule of Nahapāna and then came the Bhacchaṭṭhāṇas who ruled for 242 years. They were succeeded by the Guptas whose rule lasted for 231 years.[1] As we have seen, according to the Jaina traditions, Gardabhilla's rule began in 74 B.C. and it is assigned 13 years (i.e., 74-61 B.C.) of which the last four years were spent fighting hard with the Śakas and for the next four years the Śakas were in sole occupation of Ujjayinī, at the end of which, in 57 B.C., they were ousted.[2] Thus the dynasty of Gardabhilla including Vikramāditya and his successors would seem to last from 74 B.C. to A.D. 26 or up to A.D. 30 or 34 if the period of the intervening Śaka rule or even that of the war is excluded. The upper and lower limits of Nahapāna's reign would therefore come to A.D. 26 and A.D. 75 respectively, and it is the time to which some of the modern scholars are inclined to assign this famous Kṣaharāta ruler of Surāṣṭra.[3] Curiously enough the above-mentioned old text designates the next family as भच्छट्ठणाण; the reading of the printed edition is, however, भत्थट्ठणाण.[4] The late Dr. Hiralal Sud commenting on these verses interpreted the term as 'probably भ्रत्यान्ध्र or आन्ध्रभृत्य'.[5] But as Satyaśrāva rightly observes, by no rule of Prakrit philology the term can be interpreted as भ्रत्यान्ध्राः or आन्ध्रभृत्याः and

---

[1] *Tiloyapaṇṇati* (Solapur ed.), Chap. IV, vv. 1507, 1508. And it is corroborated by *Harivamśa-purāṇa* and *Trilokasāra*.

[2] See footnote on p. 63 ante; also Chap. IV.

[3] Dr. Altekar places him in *circa* A.D. 55. See 'The Date of Nahapāna' in *PIHC*, Nagpur, 1950, pp. 35-42.

[4] भच्छट्ठणाण (भत्थट्ठणाण) कालो दोण्णि सयाइ हवति वादाला।
तत्तो गुत्ताताण रज्जेदोण्णिय सयामि इगितीसा ॥

—*Tiloyapaṇṇati*, IV.1508.

[5] *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit MSS. in C.P. and Berar*, Nos. 94, 98, p. XVI. Following this lead the editors of *Tiloyapaṇṇati* have also translated this term as Bhratya-Āndhras.

this Sanskrit rendering of the Prakrit reading is altogether untenable.[1] In fact, the simple and correct rendering of these Prakrit expressions would be भद्रचष्टना: or भृत्यचष्टना:. The Kharoṣṭhi legend on Caṣṭana's coinage is available in the form of चठनस. Hence भद्रचष्टन in Prakrit would be भच्छट्ठण and its plural भच्छट्ठणाण; similarly भृत्यचष्टना. would be भत्यट्ठणाणं. In the inscriptions of the Western Kṣatrapas of Caṣṭana's line we often get the epithet भद्रमुख (of noble bearing) used before the names of these kings.[2] Hence the use of the expression भद्रचष्टना: for this important dynasty of Śaka Kṣatrapas of western India is quite appropriate.[3] This family, unlike the Kuṣaṇas, was a purely Śaka family. Verse 1508 of *Tiloyapaṇṇati* when read together with verses 1503-04 thereof, leaves no doubt as to the fact that by the term भच्छट्ठणाणं are meant the Śakas and no other family or people. Moreover, in this work which has more or less a contemporary value for the history of the early centuries of the Christian era, we get the earliest record in literature which preserves the name of Caṣṭana. Caṣṭana and his early successors are known to have been serious rivals for power of the later Sātavāhanas, and though their dynasty is known to have lasted till the reign of Candragupta II Vikramāditya, it began to be rapidly eclipsed by the rise of the Guptas soon after A.D. 320.

---

[1] *Śakas in India*, p. 19.

[2] See Godha Pillar Insc. of Rudrasena, in which he gives the names of his predecessors to all of which this epithet is added, viz., राजनमहाक्षत्रप भद्रमुखस्वामी चस्टन, etc. (*EI*, X, App. II —Southern Insc. No. 962, also No. 967).

[3] It may be noted that the Śaka Kṣatrapas of western India had by this time been fully Indianized in their language, religion, customs and practices and were not looked upon as foreigners. They were also benevolent rulers and patronised art and learning (See Junagarh Insc. of Rudradāman, ibid., No. 965).

Our source assigns them 242 years which, beginning from A.D. 78, gives the year A.D. 320, which exactly coincides with the commencement of the Guptas whom this source places soon after the Bhadra-Caṣṭanas. It also assigns to the Guptas 231 years, and the dynasty including both the earlier and later branches, is not known to have lasted much beyond A.D. 550. Devagupta II who is assigned to this time, as also Harigupta, a predecessor or some elderly kinsman of Devagupta, are both said to have turned Jaina ascetics, and the latter is also said to have been a contemporary of the Hūṇa king Toramāṇa, as the *Kuvalayamālā* (A.D. 778) expressly asserts.

Therefore, there remains no doubt that the popular Śaka era of A.D. 78 commenced with the rise of the Bhadra-Caṣṭanas or the western Kṣatrapa line of Castana and that he was the second Śaka king of the Jaina tradition who rose to power 605 years and 5 months after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. It appears that Caṣṭana's predecessor, Gasomatika, and even Castana himself were originally in the service of Nahapāna, and after the latter's death Caṣṭana, becoming independent of the Ksaharātas, rose to power.[1] The year A.D. 78 seems to have marked a turning point in his fortunes, particularly by his conquest of Ujjayinī about the month of March (middle of Indian month of Caitra) in that year. His greatest rival, the Śālivāhana king, who was probably Vāśiṣṭhiputra Puḷumāyi, could not tolerate it and waged war. During the same year or sometimes later he might have won a partial victory over the Kṣatrapa and consequently tried to appropriate his era too, though with no great success. It is also quite

[1] And if it is so, the name 'Bhṛtya-Caṣṭanas' may also fit them.

likely that just about the year A.D. 78 Kaniṣka might have laid the foundations of his Kuṣaṇa empire in northern India, with Peshawar (Puruṣapura) as his capital. The year was also very momentous in the history of the Jaina Saṁgha as it saw the great division into Digambara and Śvetāmbara sects, and therefore was not likely to be forgotten by the Jaina writers.

CHAPTER V

THE EARLIER SAKA ERA

In the previous chapter we discussed the popular and current Śaka era of A.D. 78. But it was not the only Śaka era instituted, and perhaps at one time prevalent, in India, nor was it the first. That there was at least one more, an older or 'Earlier Śaka Era,' as Dr. K.P. Jayaswal designated it[1], is a belief held by a majority of modern scholars.

The presence of the Śakas in India for a considerably long time prior to the appearance of the Caṣṭanas and the Kusaṇas on the Indian scene is a fact which nobody seems to doubt. There is also a general tendency in favour of assigning the many Kharoṣṭhi and Brāhmī records relating to Maues, Azes and Gondophernes, Liaka and Paṭika, Rajjubala and Śoḍāsa, Nahapāna and Uṣavadāta, Kujula and Wima Kadphises, discovered in the north-west, the south-west and the Mathura region, which are dated in an unspecified era and range from the year 41 to 399, to some earlier era attributed to the Śakas themselves. Opinions, however, differ as regards the starting point of this earlier Śaka era.

Dr. Jayaswal believed it to have started somewhere between 145 and 100 B.C.[2], and finally fixed it in 123 B.C.[3] R. D. Banerji places its commencement in 100 B.C[4].,

[1] *JBORS*, Vol. VI, pt. 1 (1920), p. 21.
[2] ibid.
[3] ibid., XVI, pt. 3-4, p. 240.
[4] *IA* (1908), XXXVII, pp. 63-67.

Sir John Marshall in 95 B.C.[1] and Wan Vijk in 84-80 B.C.[2] Sten Konow formerly believed it to have started sometime between 88-60 B.C.[3], but he finally fixed it in 83 B.C.[4] Smith and Boyer put it in 57 B.C.[5], and there are others who identify it with the Vikrama era itself.[6] Even Rapson, the greatest exponent of only one Indian Śaka era, and that too the one started by Kaniṣka in A.D. 78, admitted the possibility of the existence of an earlier Śaka era when he says, "And it may not unreasonably be suggested that the Śakas, like other foreign invaders at all periods, may have brought with them into India their own system of reckoning, and that this may be the Era used in Seistan." He suggested that it might have started in 150 B.C.[7], and Prof. Tarn fixes it in 155 B.C.[8], the former attributing it to the Parthians and the latter to the Sakas themselves.

Of all these dates suggested for the commencement of the Earlier Śaka Era, Tarn's and Rapson's are the earliest. But they do not seem to be likely. No trace of such an era starting in 150 B.C. or thereabout is available in Seistan and the adjoining regions. In India, we begin to get records from the year 41 of this era, which appears to be a reasonable time the Śakas may have taken to settle after their entry in this country.

---

[1] *JRAS*, 1914, p. 986.

[2] *CII*, Vol. II. 1; *Acta Orientalia* (Oslo, Norway, 1924),III, p. 83.

[3] *CII*, II. 1, pp. 31, 90-91.

[4] *Acta Orientalia*, III, p. 83.

[5] V. Smith, *The Jaina Stupa and other Antiquities of Mathura* (Allahabad, 1901), Introduction.

[6] H.K. Deb, *JRAS*, 1922, p. 42; *The Age of Imperial Unity*, Ch. VIII.

[7] *CHI*, I, p. 570 (1935 edition); *JRAS*, 1930, pp. 186, 193.

[8] *The Greeks in Bactria and India* by W.W. Tarn (Cambridge, 1938), App. 16, p. 502.

At the same time it is such a small interval that it precludes the possibility of its having originated in far off Seistan. Moreover, the dates in the above-mentioned Indian records if reckoned according to an era of 150 B.C. would place them in the 2nd century B.C., which is too early a date for the Śaka chiefs mentioned in them, and which does not find favour with any scholar.

To identify the E.S.E. with the Vikrama era is also erroneous. The Vikrama era has never been designated the Śaka era, at least for centuries until after the Śakas had been practically forgotten and the term Śaka had changed its etymological sense. Besides, the Śaka Kṣatrapas of the north and of the west would never have used an era which, as we have seen, was a reminder of their defeat and disgrace and which had been started by their enemies, the Mālavas, to celebrate their victory over and deliverance from the Śakas themselves. The Vikrama era was not associated with the Śaka king Azes I as was believed by Marshall, or with Nahapāna the Śaka Ksaharāta as suggested by R.D. Banerji and Barnett, or with any other Śaka chief or even with any other foreigner. The suggestion that the traditional Śaka era was none else but the Vikrama era itself, because it marked the death of a Śaka tyrant, seems to be far-fetched. An era which symbolised the death, defeat and discomfiture of the Śakas could not be called a Śaka era and could not have been used as such by the Śakas themselves. It is, however, possible that the Mālava people and their leader Vikramāditya were inspired by the example of the Śakas since we have reason to believe that at that date there certainly existed an era started by the Śakas. The Mālavas might have adopted their reckoning and recommenced that era from the year of their victory, i.e., 57 B.C.

Sten Konow seems to entertain the idea of three Śaka eras. That a Śaka era did commence in A.D. 78 he has to admit, but he holds that its founder was Wima Kadphises, the predecessor of Kaniska. The basis of his argument is the Khalātsi inscription, said to be dated in the year 184 or 187. He believes this record to belong to Wima Kadphises and that it must have been dated in the Earlier Śaka Era which could have commenced at the latest in 58 B.C. Hence the year 187 of this E.S.E. would fall in A.D. 129 which, according to him, marked the last year of Wima's and the first year of Kaniṣka's reign, and would thus prove that the Kaniṣka era commenced in A.D. 129. Further, that the year 136 of the Chir Stupa inscription belonging to Kujula Kadphises or Kadphises I marks the last year of that ruler's reign and the first year of that of Wima; and according to the above calculation this year would fall in A.D. 78.[1]

But in the light of the following criticisms, Konow's theory sounds untenable:

We get no records in Wima's era, not even his own.

From the Junagarh inscription of Kṣatrapa Rudradāman (A.D. 130-50) dated in the year 72 (A.D. 150) we learn that his rule extended to Sindhu and Sauvira and that he was dependent on none (स्वयं अधिगतमहाक्षत्रप). If Kaniṣka's reign is made to commence in A.D. 129, he would be a contemporary of Rudradāman. But from Kaniṣka's Sui Vihāra inscription we know that his kingdom included lower Indus valley. Obviously these two rulers could not have been contemporaries of each other. Caṣṭana and Rudradāman were contemporaries of Kuntal and Puḷu-

[1] *CII*, Vol. II, op. cit.

māyi Sātakarṇis, and the latter belonged to the period of A.D. 78-150. This fact is also borne out by Ptolemy who writing in *circa* A.D. 140 mentions both Caṣṭana and Puḷumāyi. So these rulers cannot be placed much beyond A.D. 130.

K. P. Jayaswal and John Marshall believed that there must have been some interval between Kadphises II and Kaniṣka, but Konow's calculations leave no room for such an interval.

The Kuṣana Shāhi whom the contemporary Chinese authorities speak of as conquering India at least 180 years after the independence of Ta-hia, which is said to have taken place in 134 B.C., was Yeng-Kao-Chen (Wima Kuṣaṇa) and not Kadphises I (i.e., Kujula). This conqueror of India is therein said to have been the son of an octogenarian.[1] The son of an eighty-year old father could not possibly have reigned for over 65 years (i.e., 122-87 E.S.E.). The same authority tells us that the king of Ta-Yueh-Chi had sent an embassy to the then Chinese emperor in 2 B.C. The date is quite probable for that long-lived king, Wima's father. We are further informed that the Chinese chronicler, Pan-Ku, who died in A.D. 92, refers to Yueh-Chi's occupation of Kabul. It means that the Kuṣaṇas were in possession of Kabul before A.D. 92.

The Kusana inscriptions usually use one or more of the epithets, Kuṣaṇa or Guṣana, Shāhi or Shāhānushāhi, Rājātirāja and Devaputra, before the names of their kings. Their earliest records, the Panjitar inscription of the year 122 and Chir Stupa inscrip-

[1] This Chinese authority is the Hou-Han-Shu (A.D. 445) whose principal source about these Yueh-Chi is Pan-Ku (A.D. 25-55), vide., O. Franke, *IA*, 1906, pp. 33-47; also Raychaudhuri's *Political History of Ancient India* (1950), pp. 458-73; *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 122.

tion of the year 136 use the epithets Devaputra and Kuṣaṇa; those of Kaniṣka and his successors also use one or more of these epithets.[1] But the Khalātsi inscription which is alleged to be dated in the year 187 uses simply the expression 'Maharajasa-Uvimka-vitthasa' according to Konow's own reading. There is nothing very clear or authentic about the record. It is not a state document. Even if the year mentioned in it is proved to be correct, it is possible that the record might have belonged to some other Śaka chief, alien and antagonistic to the Kuṣaṇas, and who, therefore, instead of using Kaniṣka's era or the popular Śaka era of A.D. 78, used the Earlier Śaka Era.

It is evident from the Chinese sources that the first Kuṣaṇa chief who conquered India and set up a kingdom here was Wima Kadphises. He was probably the second king of the line and might have made this conquest in the lifetime of his father, Kujula Kadphises. There seems to be nothing in the records of 122 and 136 to make them belong to Kujula. They may well belong to Wima and to him they should be attributed. It would, therefore, mean that this Kadphises II invaded India sometime before 122 E.S.E. and lived at least till the year 136. After a few years of his death Kaniska seems to have ascended the throne, about A.D. 78. In his records he used his own regnal years, but his successors by giving their dates in continuation of Kaniṣka's years gave this reckoning the shape of an era. It, however, seems to have gone out of use even in the territories over which the Kuṣaṇas

---

[1] For example a Mathura Inscription mentions Kaniṣka as:

'महाराज राजातिराज देवपुत्र शाही कनिष्क'

—See *EI*, X, App., No. 21.

ruled, soon after their decline in the second century, though the real Śaka era which started in A.D. 78 in Ujjayinī continued to enjoy increasing popularity in the west and the south. As we have seen there is every probability that Kaniṣka's accession almost coincided with the commencement of this era and thus there is no need to push his date forward to A.D. 129 or to some other later date. In fact, no era is known to have commenced in the 2nd century A.D. Most of the modern scholars, including Oldenberg, Thomas, Rapson, Banerji, Jayaswal and Raychaudhuri, definitely fix Kaniṣka's accession in A.D. 78. Even Smith, when he says that the Kuṣaṇa era began about A.D. 60 or 65, not before A.D. 30 and not later than A.D. 78, confirms the same.[1] Thus both the theories, that Kaniska ruled in the 1st century B.C. or that he lived in the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. prove untenable.[2] At the same time, it also implies that the advent of the Kuṣaṇas cannot be placed much earlier than A.D. 50 nor later than A.D. 78 which means the commencement of the E.S.E., in which Wima's inscriptions of years 122 and 136 are presumed to have been dated, too, cannot be pushed farther back beyond the sixties or seventies of the 1st century B.C. Those who are in favour of earlier dates base their suggestions on vague conjectures or believe the era to have originated outside India.

The earliest Śaka king mentioned in Indian inscriptions and coins is Maues (Mahārya Moga of the Taxila plate). His earliest available record is dated in the year 42 and a later one in the year 78. On the basis of the Chinese authorities referred to above, Dr. Ray-

[1] V. Smith, *The Jain Stupa, etc.* (Allahabad, 1901), pp. 4-5.

[2] Dr. Bhandarkar seems to have placed Kaniṣka's accession in A.D. 278 (*IA*, 1908, p. 55).

chaudhuri thinks that Maues should be placed after 33 B.C., which would make the E.S.E. begin in 75 B.C. Since this scholar is also inclined to identify the E.S.E. with the Vikrama era, he says Maues might have ruled up to A.D. 20-22.[1] Apart from the fact that there is no likelihood of the Śakas' using an alien era, especially when it symbolised their own defeat and discomfiture, it is at variance with the date of Gondophernes who is definitely known to have begun his rule at Taxila in A.D. 19 and to have come after Maues.[2]

Similarly, the Mathura Satraps, Rajjubala, Śoḍāsa, etc., could not have used the Vikrama era. They must have used the E.S.E. The arguments which scholars advance in favour of the records of these Satraps being dated in the era of 58 B.C. will equally hold good even if the E.S.E. is proved to have commenced within a decade or so prior to 58 B.C. Some scholars, however, believe these records to have been dated in the era of Kaniṣka, which means A.D. 78.[3] There is no doubt that these Satraps were not Kuṣāṇas but were Śakas. And Ptolemy (*circa* A.D. 140) places neither Taxila nor Mathura within Indo-Scythia. He mentions only Patalene, Abhira and Kāṭhiāwāḍa as parts of the Indian dominions of the Śakas, which is also confirmed by Rudradāman's Junāgarh inscription of that time. Moreover, this theory would make Kaniṣka's successors contemporary to these Kṣatrapas of Mathura. But many inscriptions, especially Jaina ones, discovered from the neighbourhood of Mathura and belonging to both the Kuṣāṇas and the Kṣatrapas, sometimes bearing identical date years,

---

[1] *PHAI*, pp. 439-440.
[2] Prof. Tarn, op. cit., App. XVI, pp. 494-498; *CHI*, p. 576.
[3] See *EI*, X, App.; *IA*, 1908, p. 55; *CHI*, p. 585.

have no common names of the Jaina gurus or laity mentioned in them. Names found in the Kṣatrapa records are quite different from those in the Kuṣaṇa ones.[1] The fact that in the same locality and in the records of the same community, belonging apparently to same dates, two different sovereign authorities, one as 'Svāmi Mahāksatrapa' and the other as 'Rājātirāja Sāhī Devaputra' find mention, but both never together, leaves no room for the belief that they might have been contemporaries. The coins of the Ksatrapas succeed those of the Śuṅgas. Rajjubala in his coinage imitates Strabo II. Hence, as Marshall also says, if Rajjubala is nearer to the Śuṅgas and to Strabo II, these Ksatrapas cannot be placed so long after the beginning of the Christian era, never in the 2nd century A.D.[2] It also appears that for some time Mathura was out of the hands of the Śakas. A Jaina inscription from Mathura itself curiously confirms this fact. The inscription is on a votive tablet (Āyāga-paṭṭa) set up by Simitā, the Kauśiki wife of Gotiputra, who is described herein as 'a black serpent to the Poṭhayas and the Śakas.'[3]

The date of Nahapāna and Usavadāta of the Ksaharāta family of Surāṣṭra is another baffling problem. It is generally accepted that they preceded the Caṣṭanas, though some scholars still persist in assigning them to the 2nd century A.D.[4] Several inscriptions ranging from the year 41 to 46, written at the instance of Nahapāna's son-in-law Uṣavadāta or his minister Ayam, and appa-

[1] vide., *EI*, X, App. · List of Brahmi Inscriptions, H. Luders.
[2] Marshall, *Indian Coins*, p 13; *CHI*, plate V, 7.
[3] *EI*, X, App. No. 94. Incidentally this Jaina inscription is, besides the Mathura Lion Capital inscription, the earliest epigraphical record to mention the Śakas (*IA*, 1908, p. 49).
[4] For example, Rapson (*CHI*, I, p. 585).

rently in the life-time of Nahapāna, have been discovered. Those like Rapson, who believe all Indian records of the Śakas to have been dated in the era of A.D. 78, place Nahapāna in A.D. 119-124. Many scholars assign these records to the corresponding years of the E.S.E. But since there are vast differences of opinion as regards the starting point of this era, Nahapāna is also placed in different parts of the 1st century B.C. Among these again, those in favour of a date towards the close of the 1st century B.C. (i.e., 16-12 B.C.), taking the commencement of the E.S.E. in 58 B.C., are in the majority.[1] But there are others who take these years not to belong to any regular era but to be merely the regnal years of Nahapāna. They generally place him in the first century A.D. Dr. Deoras argued, 'we must give up the theory that Nahapāna has to be placed in the 2nd century A.D. As the coinage of Wima Kadphises was prevalent in the empire of Nahapāna, we may assign Nahapāna to *circa* A.D. 37 to 85.'[2] Dr. A.S. Altekar fixed this ruler's date as A.D. 55-105.[3] If Nambanus, the king of Minnagar, mentioned in the *Periplus* (*c.* A.D. 70), be identified with Nahapāna, he would certainly belong to about the middle of the 1st century A.D. The well-known rivalry and contemporaneity of Nahapāna with Gautamiputra Śātakarṇi also seems to favour this date.

Among the Jaina sources, the *Niryukti* of the *Āvaśyaka-sūtra* as also the *Cūrṇi* on that *Sūtra*, give details of the defeat and death of Nahapāna at the hands

---

[1] viz., Duberuil (*Ancient History of Deccan*, pp. 20 ff); Bakhle (*JBBRAS*, 1927, pp. 66 ff.); Cunningham (*ASI*), etc.

[2] *PIHC*, 1940, pp. 152-53.

[3] ibid., 1950, pp. 35-42.

of the Sātavāhanas at Bhṛgukaccha.[1] The *Srutāvatāra* of Bibudha Śrīdhara[2], however, makes Nahapāna a king of Vāmmideśa with its capital at Vasundhara, and informs us that after ruling for some time he abdicated his throne and became a Jaina monk. As such he came to be famous by the name of Ācārya Bhūtabali and was a disciple and contemporary of Arhadbali, Dharasena and Puṣpadanta. As we shall see in the next chapter all these gurus belong to about the middle of the 1st century A.D. Nahapāna would also belong to this period, provided there is some truth in this tradition. We have seen that the *Tiloyapaṇṇati* placing him in between the Gardabhillas and the Caṣṭanas seems to assign him to A.D. 26-76.

All this discussion about Nahapāna, therefore, shows that either the years in his inscriptions are his own regnal years, or they are the years of the E.S.E., in which case they must have been the very early years of his reign of 40 years and that the E.S.E. must have started not more than a decade or so before 57 B.C.

Then we have an inscription of Gondophernes of the year 103 from which it seems that he then ruled at Gāndhāra.[3] That this ruler belonged to the first half of the 1st century A.D. is an established fact.[4] Hence his inscriptions must have been dated in the E.S.E. which must have started not very long before 57 B.C.

On the basis of the Lion Capital inscription of Mathura (*c.* 25 B.C.), Sten Konow surmises that the several Śaka chiefs, viz., Rajjubala, Soḍāsa, etc., men-

---

[1] See Jayaswal, *Dynasties of* the *Kali Age*, p. 49, etc., and Dr. Deoras, *PIHC*, 1940, p. 150.

[2] Published in M.D.J.G. (Bombay), No. 21.

[3] See H.K. Deb, *JRAS*, 1922, p. 42.

[4] Rapson assigns him to A.D. 19-45 and his inscription of year 103, of his 26th year to A.D. 45 (*CHI*, I, p. 576).

tioned therein, were those who had been driven out of Ujjayinī in 56 B.C. by king Vikrama who then started an era; that the Śakas then established their rule in Mathura about the same time; and that thus the same base was used for two different reckonings—the independence of Malwa and the establishment of the Śaka power in Mathura.[1] In another context, the same scholar says, "Jaina sources tell us of a tradition about the Śaka chiefs who conquered Malwa but were ousted by Vikrama, and they go on to say that another Śaka king made an end to his dynasty and established an era of his own after 135 years of Vikrama. This episode explains the origin of the Śaka era." Sten Konow thus places the first appearance of the Śakas on the Indian scene a little before 57 B.C.—and in this he has not only made good use of the Jaina sources but is also not far from the truth.

That they were the Śakas of Seistan who established their rule in India in the first century B.C. is an admitted fact. Dr. J. J. Modi proves on the evidence of the *Avesta*, the inscriptions of Darius and of Pahlavi and Persian books, that Śakasthāna (Seistan) had been under the Iranians for a long time prior to 160 B.C.[2] About 135 B.C. the Śakas, driven from their home on the north bank of the Oxus by pressure of the Yue-Chi, overran the Greek kingdom of Bactria. Expelled even from their new settlement by their relentless pursuers they flung themselves upon Parthia. And it was not till the end of the reign of the Parthian king Mithridates II (123-88 B.C.) that they were finally worsted in the struggle. Thus by a fortunate accident the Greek

---

[1] 'Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronology', *Journal of Indian History*, XVII, pp. 22-23.

[2] *JBORS*, XVII, pt. ii, p. 337.

kingdom of upper Kabul valley obtained a new lease.[1] But in 88 B.C. Mithridates II himself died and there was none to keep them in check. Soon they threw away the yoke of Parthia and became independent. It was sometimes after this event that the Sakas, actuated by the enthusiasm of a newly won victory and freed for a time from the relentless pursuit of their enemies, marched forward to India, crossed the Hindukush and settled in Puṣkalāvatī and Taxila. Thence they spread over the whole of the lower Indus valley. And these Indus valley settlements of the early Sakas came to be known as Sagakula, Sakasthāna or Indo-Scythia. In doing so they seem to have met practically no resistance. The first entry of the Sakas into India cannot, therefore, be placed before 84-80 B.C. and it might well have taken place sometimes between 80-70 B.C.

From the *Kālakācārya Kathānaka*, referred to in the previous chapter, it appears that the Sagakula was not far from Malwa. Having failed in all his attempts to make the tyrannical and licentious Gardabhilla see sense and undo the injustice he had done, Kālaka went to these Saka Shāhis who are said to have been 96 in number and who were settled in Sindh. He succeeded in persuading them to help him in punishing the tyrant. With him they came to Malwa, fought Gardabhilla and forced him to flee from the country. The date of this Kālaka who was the second guru of that name according to the pontifical lists is found to be, on independent evidence, M.E. 453[2] (or 74 B.C.), whereas according

[1] U.N. Ghoshal, *Ancient Indian Culture in Afghanistan.*

[2] तिसयपणवीस इदो, चउसयतिपन्न (४५३) सरसईगहिआ।
नवसय तिनवइवीराचउत्थिए, जो कालगायरिआ॥

—cited in 'Kālakācārya,' *Anekānta*, X. 1, p. 37; also see *Khartara Gaccha Paṭṭāvali*; Kalyāṇavijaya's 'Abhikālaka,' *Dvivedi Volume* (Banaras), pp. 94-120.

to the dynastic chronologies the date of Gardabhilla (Darpaṇa or Mahendrāditya Gandharvasena) comes to M.E. 453-466 (or 74-61 B.C.).[1] From the text of the same *Kathānaka* we also learn that the Śakas had to fight for full four years before they could finally force the king of Ujjayinī to give up the struggle and flee away. They were now the sole masters of Ujjayinī, but they could enjoy the fruit of their victory only for four more years at the end of which they were defeated and driven away from that place. According to the above reckoning this event took place in 57 B.C., which coincides exactly with the starting point of the Mālava or Vikrama era which was founded by the people to commemorate their liberation from the Śakas. Thus the Śakas ruled over Malwa from 61-57 B.C. and previous to that they had been fighting for 4 years (i.e., 65-61 B.C.) for the possession of Ujjayinī.

The year 66 B.C., therefore, marked their first entry into Malwa and their encampment in the neighbourhood of Ujjayinī. It might also have witnessed their first victory, though a partial and indecisive one. In order to celebrate this first success on Indian soil, outside their Sagakula, the Śaka Shāhis started an era. The principal Śaka Shāhis or lieutenants, after their defeat and expulsion from Ujjayinī in 57 B.C., seem to have dispersed over the country. Thus Ghaṭaka and Bhūmaka, the predecessors of Nahapāna, settled in Surāṣṭra and Kāṭhiāwāḍa, those of Rajjubala went to Mathura and settled there, some like Mevaki reached as far as Varanasi, others like Liaka and Paṭika settled at Taxila and in the Punjab, and so on. All these Śaka chiefs called themselves Kṣaharātas or Kṣatrapas (i.e.,

[1] cf., *Abhidhāna Rājendra*, Pt. V, p. 1289.

satraps), and though most of them were virtually independent rulers, they seem to have owed nominal allegiance to the Shāhānushāhi at Puṣkalāvatī, who was probably the predecessor of Maues.

That the E.S.E. started in 66 B.C. is also curiously confirmed by another still more ancient Jaina text, the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*.[1] In its fourth chapter in the course of describing the Āryakhaṇḍa of the Bharatakṣetra, an important part of the Jambudvīpa, the work gives some valuable historical traditions in about 43 verses. While discussing the date of Mahāvīra, it states (in verse 1496) that 'After the lapse of 461 years from the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra the Śakarājā came in power.' In verses 1501, 1503, and 1504 it again refers to this date of the Śaka king and makes him the founder of a line of kings which is said to have lasted for two centuries and a half. Moreover, after specifically stating in verse 1496, his own belief, or the one which he held to be the best supported in his own times, regarding the beginning of the Śaka rule (i.e., M.E 461=66 B.C.), in the next three verses the author of this text goes on to state three other divergent or alternative views on this point, using with them the word (अहवा, or). The last of these views places the Śaka king 605 years and 5 months after the *nirvāṇa* which exactly coincides with the starting point of the later Śaka era in the middle of the Indian month of Caitra of the year A.D. 78. The other two views given in between seem to be enigmatic and at present seem to bear no simple explanation. It is, however, quite evident from the

[1] The date of its original composition by Yativṛṣabha is c. A.D. 176, but in its present form the work appears to be a subsequent recension dating c. A.D. 750 (Published from Solapur 1951).

text that the figure which the original author favoured and regarded as the correct one of all the four was 461. And M.E. 461 falls in 66 B.C.

From a discussion of the views of modern scholars on this point, we have already seen that there is nothing improbable about this date. The different classes of Jaina sources—the *Kālakācārya Kathānaka*, the *Paṭṭāvalis*, dynastic chronologies, traditions relating to Vikrama and the Śakas, and the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*—all clearly point to this date more or less definitely. The histories of the Indo-Greeks of Bactria, the Indo-Parthians of Parthia, the Indo-Scythians of Seistan and Indo-Scythia, the Chinese authorities, Ptolemy's evidence, the facts about the Śaka-Sātavāhana rivalry, the archæological, numismatic, epigraphic and palæographic evidence—all go to confirm this date. Most of the modern scholars who believe in the existence of the E.S.E., whatever their opinions may be about its starting point, seem to have nothing to say against this date. The arguments of those in favour of some date between 84 and 57 B.C., in support of their respective suggestions, can equally well apply in favour of this date.

It would also mean that like the Vikrama and the later Śaka eras this E.S.E. of 66 B.C., too, was associated in its origin with Ujjayinī. This celebrated city was not only the capital of Malwa which incidentally has been one of the richest regions in the whole of India, but was also the foremost centre of intellectual and cultural activity in the country and continued to be so till the close of the middle ages. Centrally situated, this home of Indian art and learning has ever been the meeting place of cultures and civilizations of the North and the South, and of the East and the West. All important and powerful emperors

or kings of India coveted its possession. No wonder the early Śakas considered their first attempt on this city a worthy occasion for starting an era.[1] Their era was also a Kṛta era, as it began in the month of Kārttika. They might have adopted the reckoning of the Jainas (i.e., the M.E.) and simply recommenced it from that important year of their career in India; or the event itself might have incidentally fallen in that month. At least eight years after, the Mālavas certainly seem to have adopted this E.S.E., recommencing it from the year of their own victory in 57 B.C. The Śakas could get an opportunity to write off this disgrace only 135 years after that event when they again conquered Ujjayinī and started another era of their own. According to Ptolemy also the capital of Tiastanes (Caṣṭanas) was Ozene (VII. 63).

We do not know whether the Śakas had brought some reckoning of their own with them from Seistan or Parthia. If there was any it seems to have been given up soon after their settling in India. It is also not likely that they started some era on their first entry into India and settling at Puṣkalāvatī, for there would be no sense in starting another era only a few years later if such an era had existed. At least the Śaka satraps of Mathura, Varanasi, Surāṣṭra, Sindh and Taxila seem to have dated their records in this E.S.E. of 66 B.C. We begin to get these records from the year 41. In the north-west and in the Mathura region for a time Kaniska's era superseded this E.S.E., but after the decline of the Kuṣaṇas, the E.S.E. again seems

[1] In *The Jaina Stupa etc.* Smith also expressed the opinion that the Earlier Śaka Era probably coincided with the accession of Nahapāna in western India and that it originated in the west and not in the north of India.

to have come into use. The Brāhmī inscription of the year 299 from Mathura and the three Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions of the years 318, 384 and 399 from the North-western regions seem to have been dated in the E.S.E. of 66 B.C. In the west and the south, however, the Śaka era of the Caṣṭanas, of A.D. 78, absolutely superseded the E.S.E. and went on gaining increasing popularity.

Some of the relevant dates in this E.S.E. of 66 B.C. would be :—

Nahapāna	—year	41	= 25 B.C.*
Nahapāna, Uṣavadāta and Ayam	—years	41-46	=25-20 B.C.*
Mathura Lion Capital	—year	42	= 24 B.C.
Inscription of Maues	— „	42	= 24 B.C.
Taxila Satraps—Liaka, Paṭika, etc—	— „	72	= A.D. 6
Śoḍāsa of Mathura ..	— „	72	= A.D. 6
Taxila Copperplate of Moga	— „	78	= A.D. 12
Gondophernes ..	— „	85	= A.D. 19
—do— ..	— „	103	= A.D. 37
Mahārāja Guṣana-Panjatar Insc.	— „	122	= A.D. 56
Wima Kadphises-Taxila silver scroll	— „	136	= A.D. 70
Khalātsi Insc. ..	— „	187	= A.D. 121
Taxila Duck Vase Insc. of Jihonika	— „	191	= A.D. 125
Mathura Inscription	— „	299	= A.D. 233
Kharoṣṭhi Inscription	— „	318	= A.D. 252
—do—	— „	384	= A.D. 318
—do—	— „	399	= A.D. 333

* In case they are not the regnal years.

CHAPTER VI

THE SARASVATĪ MOVEMENT

FROM the Kaṅkālī Ṭīlā site in the neighbourhood of Mathura a mutilated image of goddess Sarasvatī, holding in her left hand a book of loose leaves, the cover of which is marked with a *gomūtrika* design, and holding out her right hand probably in *varada* or *abhaya mudrā*, and with an inscription in old Brāhmī characters, dated in the year 54, has been discovered.[1] This goddess is the presiding deity of learning and literature in the Jaina as well as Hindu pantheons. The image in question is not only the earliest known image of a Jaina Sarasvatī but is also the oldest representation of that goddess so far discovered in the whole of India. Two small attendant figures, one on each side of the deity, stand near its feet and one of them is found wearing a Śaka uniform. The image is said to have been dedicated by a worker in metal (*lohika-kāruka*), Gova, the son of Siha, at the request of Vācaka Ārya-deva, the companion (*sraddhācāro*) of Gaṇī Ārya Māga Hasti, the disciple of Vācaka Ārya Hasta Hasti, out of the Koṭṭiya Gaṇa, Thāniya Kula, Vaira Śākhā.[2] The inscription mentions no king and there is nothing in it which can assign it either to the period of the Kṣatrapas or to that of the Kuṣanas. Hence the image could have been dated equally well in either the E.S.E. of 66 B.C. or in the S.E. of A.D. 78, which would accordingly assign it to 12 B.C. at the earliest and to

[1] Preserved in the State Museum, Lucknow, cf., *Anekānta*, VIII. 1, p. 61; Smith, *Jaina Stupa etc.*, p. 57; *JA*, XI. 2, pp. 1-4.
[2] *EI*, Vol. X, App. (Luders), No. 54 (J. 24).

A.D. 132 at the latest. It might not necessarily have been the first image of this type. The practice of setting up such images of Sarasvatī might have started earlier, and even prior to that it must have taken considerable time to conceive and then popularise this symbolic representation of literature.

For the bookless Nirgranthas, who had ever been averse to reducing anything including their scriptures to writing, the installation of such images of goddess Sarasvatī, holding a book in her hand, is a surprisingly singular fact which itself is eloquent of its importance. This image, in fact, symbolises in a remarkable manner the great Jaina renaissance which began to bear fruit by the beginning of the Christian era. This great Sarasvatī movement, as we may call it, began sometime in the first half of the 2nd century B.C., and it was an accomplished fact by the end of the 1st century A.D. It was this movement that opened the gates for the tremendous literary activity of the Jainas. But for this movement we would perhaps not have had the rich literary and cultural heritage which constitutes an important part of our national wealth and a valuable source of our country's past history. Moreover, if the period covered by the Sarasvatī movement in the Jaina world coincides, on the one hand, with a similar epoch of renaissance in Brahmanism and Buddhism and even outside India in Greece, Rome, Egypt, China and Persia, it also marks, on the other hand, a period of transition in the political history of India and certainly saw events of far-reaching importance in the history of the Jaina Saṁgha. Hence the historical importance of the Sarasvatī movement cannot be exaggerated.

In order to realise the full significance of this movement it is necessary to know the nature and

history of the Jaina Saṁgha in the post-Mahāvīra centuries. A number of Digambara as well as Śvetāmbara *Paṭṭāvalis*, the *Śrutāvatāra Kathās*, ancient texts like the *Paīnnas* and the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, early works like the *Niryuktis*, *Cūrṇis*, *Bhāṣyas*, *Jambudvīpa-prajñapti*, *Dhavala*, *Jayadhavala*, *Harivaṁśa-purāṇa* and *Ādipurāṇa* and the later *Kathākoṣas* and *Prabandhas* throw ample light on this period and help us to reconstruct with almost a certainty the early history of the Jaina Saṁgha.

A critical and comparative examination of these sources brings out the following facts.

Almost simultaneously with the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra his chief disciple (Gaṇadhara), Indrabhūti Gautama, attained *kevala-jñāna* and after his own *nirvāṇa* was succeeded by Sudharma, and the latter, in his turn, by Jambu Svāmi. The total period allotted to these three gurus is 62 years (i.e., 527-465 B.C.). All the three were, like Mahāvīra, Arhat Kevalins and they attained *nirvāṇa*. Both the Digambara and the Śvetāmbara accounts are in perfect agreement as to their respective names, character and total period. Some sources, especially the Prākṛt *Paṭṭāvali* of the Nandi Saṁgha[1], also give their individual periods as 12, 12 and 38 years respectively.

After the three Kevalins came the five Śruta-kevalins, one after the other. They are said to have had the full and complete knowledge of the scriptures but could never attain the spiritual status of an Arhat Kevalin. The Digambara accounts allot to them a total period of 100 years, whereas the Śvetāmbara accounts that of 116 years. The names of the first

[1] Published in *JSB*, I. 4, p. 71.

four gurus are also slightly different in the two traditions, but they are in full agreement as to Bhadrabāhu I being the last guru of this group. They do not differ as regards the twelve-year famine that took place in Magadha in his times nor as regards the consequent emigration of the Jaina Saṁgha under his leadership. But while the Digambara tradition states that the Saṁgha migrated to the South, Śvetāmbara tradition says that Bhadrabāhu went to Nepal. The origin of the great schism, which later on developed into Digambara and Śvetāmbara sects, is ultimately traced to this event. Bhadrabāhu Śrutakevalin is admittedly believed to have been the last custodian of the full and whole scriptural knowledge as was taught by Lord Māhavīra. A number of inscriptions found in Śravaṇa Beḷgola, and reaching back to the early centuries of the Christian era, testify to this migration of the Jaina Saṃgha under Bhadrabāhu to South India, particularly Karnataka.[1]

After Bhadrabāhu I, the succession diverges, that of the Śvetāmbaras running quite separate from and independent of that of the Digambaras. The former represented probably the succession of the gurus who had stayed behind in Magadha in spite of the famine. After the Mauryas, the Suṅgas came into power. They are credited with the revival of Brahmanism and are said to have been antagonistic to Jainism and Buddhism. Consequently in their times the Magadhan branch of the Jaina Saṁgha migrated to Ujjayinī and for several centuries it continued to be their stronghold. Afterwards they shifted to Valabhī

[1] See R. Narsimhachar, *Inscriptions at Śravana Belgola* (*EC*, Vol. II, Bangalore, 1923).

in Gujarat. The portion of the Saṁgha that had migrated to the South spread all over the Deccan, Andhra, Trikaliṅga, Tuluva and Tamil countries, although Karnataka was its chief stronghold. Mathura, however, continued to be a sort of meeting place of the divergent sections and the gurus of this centre acted as a unifying force. Though they developed their own Gaṇas, Kulas and Śākhās, they allied themselves to neither of the two sections in particular and several important gurus hailing from Mathura have been equally owned by both the sects. There are two other points on which both the Digambara and the Śvetāmbara traditions are again in agreement—first, that after Bhadrabāhu there commenced a gradual diminution and deterioration in the original scriptural knowledge; second, that these early Jaina monks were very conservative and absolutely averse to writing down their scriptures or even anything else. They were afraid lest by redaction the scriptures should suffer from corruption. Moreover, their vow of possessionlessness and the rules of asceticism which forbade them to reside in any one place for a long time or to associate themselves unduly with householders and city or town life made it impracticable for them to pursue such literary activities. And they thought that their religious order was so well organized that they could vouchsafe the integrity, genuineness and intactness of whatever portion of the original teaching of the Lord had come down to them by oral tradition. The institution of Saṁghācāryas (heads of congregations), Gaṇis (sectional leaders), Upādhyāyas (professors), Vācakācāryas (readers or reciters), Uccāraṇācāryas (experts in spelling and pronunciation), Pracchakācāryas (adept in asking questions), and so on, seemed to guarantee

the preservation of the scriptures in their purity and original form even if they were not redacted and were only kept in memory and transmitted by word of mouth. Nevertheless, the canonical knowledge continued to decline in volume as well as in substance.

In the Śvetāmbara tradition, after Bhadrabāhu's departure Sthūlabhadra assumed the leadership of the Saṁgha in Magadha. He was a contemporary of Maurya Candragupta and Bindusāra and was the last guru to have a full knowledge of the 14 *Pūrvas*. After the famine was over he convened a council at Pāṭaliputra, at which the remnant of the Saṁgha left behind in Magadha tried to put in order the sacred lore that had fallen into a state of decay. Sthūlabhadra was succeeded by Ārya Mahāgiri and then came Suhastin who was the religious preceptor of the Maurya king Samprati who is said to have been a devout Jaina and to have done much for the glory of his religion. After Suhastin came Susthita, Indradinna (Kālaka I), Priyagrantha and Vṛddhavādī, one after the other. At this time lived Kālaka II of the Śaka-Vikrama fame. Then followed Dinnasūri, Siṁhagiri and Vairasvāmi. The last of these was the last Daśapūrvī or keeper of a part of the original canon. It was in his time in M.E. 609 (or A.D. 82) that the gradually growing schism in the Jaina Saṁgha was finalised and the two sects, Śvetāmbara and Digambara, separated for good. This guru was succeeded by Vajrasena. In the meantime the scriptural knowledge had gone on declining and the canon was again reduced to a state of disorder. Hence in M.E. 827-840 (or A.D. 300-313) a council was convened at Mathura under the presidentship of Ārya Skandila (the 33rd pontiff according to the *Kalpasūtra Therāvali*), at which whatever could be gathered from

different monks was fixed in the form of the canon. Simultaneously, another council was held at Valabhī by Nāgārjuna Sūri and it also made a similar attempt. But the two versions disagreed in many points and hence no redaction took place. Finally, in M.E. 980 (or 993), i.e., in A.D. 453 (or 466,) at another council at Valabhī held under the chairmanship of Devarddhigaṇi an attempt to reconcile the different readings of the former councils was made and the available texts were finally written down [1] Between Devarddhigaṇi and the above-mentioned Vajrasena some 13 gurus are said to have intervened.

In the Digambara tradition, after Bhadrabāhu I came the 11 Daśapūrvīs, one after the other, and they took in all 181 years. The next group was a succession of five Ekādaśa-aṅgadhārīs, which lasted 123 years. They were succeeded by another group of four gurus who had the knowledge of 10, 10, 9 and 8 *Aṅgas* respectively, coming one after the other and taking in all 99 years. Bhadrabāhu II (37-14 B.C.) was the third guru of this group, and generally all the Digambara *Paṭṭāvalis* begin from him. Lohācārya (14 B.C.—A.D. 38) was the last of these four. He is reputed to have spread Jainism in the Punjab, particularly in Agrohā, and also to have founded the Kāṣṭhāsamgha. After this group came the five Ekāṅgadhārīs or Ācārāṅgadhārīs who took in all 118 years. They were Arhadbali, Māghanandi, Dharasena, Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali. They are all important historical names as we shall presently see. According to some sources, after Lohācārya and simultaneously with the last group, four Ārātīya Yatis, named Vinayadhara, Śrīdatta, Śivadatta and

[1] See Appendix A (iii).

Arahadatta, flourished. Of these, Arahadatta seems to have been identical with Arhadbali, the first guru of the last group. A total period of 683 years is assigned to the above-mentioned 33 successors of Mahāvīra (excluding the four Ārātiya Yatis), giving an average of some 20 years each. It is unanimously believed that the flow by word of mouth of the original canonical knowledge lasted only up to the end of this period.[1]

About this time the redaction of the surviving canonical knowledge was undertaken by the Digambara Ācāryas of the South. The monks credited with this great task are placed by some sources within this period of 683 years (i.e., A.D. 38-156) and by others soon after M.E. 683 (or A.D. 156). A part of the traditional knowledge was redacted by Dharasena, Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali, and another by Gunadhara, Āryamankhu and Nāgahasti. The authorities are generally doubtful as regards the exact dates and *guruparamparā* (succession) of these redactors of the canon. Their sole and unanimous emphasis is on the point that the original canonical tradition in the memory of authorised saints survived only up to M.E. 683 (or A.D. 156) and that after that date such gurus ceased to exist.[2]

The story of this redaction as revealed by the different sources tells us that after Lohācārya, the 28th guru in succession after Mahāvīra, there was left none who had the knowledge of any *Aṅga* or *Pūrva* as a whole, but that a partial and fragmentary knowledge of the *Aṅgas* and *Pūrvas* still continued to flow by word of

[1] For the full pontifical genealogy with sources see Appendix A (iii).

[2] See *Anekānta*, III. 1 and 3; *JSB*, III. 4, pp. 125-133.

mouth and to be preserved in the memory of certain saints. Dharasena was one of these last repositories of such knowledge. He was a renowned saint, a great ascetic and a master of the *Aṣṭāṅga Mahānimitta* (clairvoyant knowledge). He resided in the Candraguphā (Moon-cave) of Girinagara in Surāṣṭra. Fearing lest the surviving traditional canon should be lost with him, he sent a message to the Ācāryas of the Dakṣiṇāpatha who were at that time assembled in the city of Veṇākataṭīpura or Mahimā situated on the bank of the river Veṇyā, in the Āndhra country.[1] The assembly thereupon sent to him two well-qualified saintly scholars, Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali by name. On their arrival Dharasena put them to some appropriate tests and, being satisfied with their ability, imparted to them the knowledge he had and bade them reduce it to writing. The subject thus treated was the *Mahā-karma-prakṛti-prābhṛta*. The two then took leave of the guru, came to Aṅkuleśvara (modern Broach) and passed the rainy season there. After the rainy season was over, Jinapālita, who was a nephew of Puṣpadanta, came to them. With him the latter migrated to the Banavāsideśa while Bhūtabali went towards the Dramiladeśa.[2] Puṣpadanta then initiated Jinapālita into the order, composed the first 20 cardinal *Sūtras*, incorporating a part of the canonical knowledge received from Dharasena, and sent Jinapālita to Bhūtabali with the manuscript. Then Bhūtabali

---

[1] 'वेणाकतटीपुरेमहामहिमा' —the place is probably identical with Mahimānagar, a village in the district of Satara. A river of that name (Veṇyā or Vena) still passes through that district.

[2] According to the *Śrutāvatāra* of Indranandi, however, they had passed the rainy season in Kurīśvara-Pattana and thence they both went to Karhāṭa where they met Jinapālita (Pub. in No. 13, M.D.J.G., Bombay, v.s. 1975).

completed the remaining major portion of the work which was divided into six main divisions and hence called the *Ṣaṭa-khaṇḍa-āgama-siddhānta*.[1] This work in the main incorporated in it the fourth *Prābhṛta* of the fifth *Vastu* of the *Agrāyaṇī Pūrva* of the *Pūrva* subdivision of the 12th *Aṅga* along with fragments from other *Aṅgas* and *Pūrvas*.[2] The work was completed on the fifth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Jyeṣṭha, which has since been known as the festival of Śruta-Pañcamī and has continued to be celebrated to this day by the worship of the scriptures and of the goddess Sarasvatī.

Like Dharasena there was another saint named Guṇadhara who had a similar partial and fragmentary knowledge of the original canon and had in particular a mastery over the *Kaṣāya-prābhṛta* which formed the third *Pāhuḍa* of the tenth *Vastu* of the fifth *Pūrva* (i.e., *Jñāna-pravāda*) of the same *Anga* (i.e., the 12th). Inspired by a similar motive he incorporated the subject-matter of that portion of the canon in 180 *Mūlasūtras* plus 53 supplementary *sūtras* and reduced them to writing.[3] After sometime this work came into the hands of Āryamaṅkhu from whom it passed on to Nāgahasti. It was from the latter that Yativṛṣabha got these *sūtras* and on them he wrote 6,000 *Cūrṇī-sūtras*.

Thus the two sets of the Digambara canon were finally redacted, and a number of commentaries were written on them in subsequent times. The last and the most important commentaries on these works are the

---

[1] The work has been published in several volumes by the J.S.U.F. Amraoti.

[2] See introd. to *Ṣaṭakhaṇḍāgama*, I. 1. Ed. Dr. Hiralal Jain and others.

[3] The work has been published with commentaries in several volumes by the Jain Saṁgha, Mathura. See introd. to Vol. I.

Dhavala and the *Jayadhavala* written by Vīrasena in the 8th century A.D.

As regards the exact dates of these redactions no definite information is available. The redactors do not seem to have belonged to any regular line of pontifical succession. Indranandi (*c.* A.D. 950) in his *Śrutāvatāra* expressly admits his inability to throw more light on the life, times or *guru-paramparā* of these ancient scholars, because there were no records or gurus present in his time who could help him in this respect. No other source either gives us any definite help. Still there is no doubt about the fact that they must have lived not much before the beginning of the Christian era and not later than M.E. 683 (or A.D. 156).

The Prākṛt *Paṭṭāvali* of the Mūla Nandi Saṁgha[1] which is one of the oldest *Paṭṭāvalis* and is the only Digambara *Paṭṭāvali* which also gives the years of individual gurus who succeeded Mahāvīra during that period of 683 years, seems to be more reliable. It places Dharasena, Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali after the Ācārāṅgadhārīs, the last of whom was Lohācārya and who according to this *Paṭṭāvali* died in M. E. 565 (or A.D. 38). This *Paṭṭāvali*, however, seems to imply that the five gurus, including Dharasena, etc., of this last group came one after the other. But in this it appears to be a bit mistaken. While there is nothing unbelievable in the fact that all of them lived sometime between A.D. 38 and A.D. 156, they all seem to have been more or less contemporaries. Arhadbali tops this list. He was the greatest Saṁghācārya of his

[1] cf., Dr. Hoernle's views on this *Paṭṭāvali* in the *Indian Antiquary*, XX, pp. 341-361.

times and is known to have convened a great assembly of Jaina monks. It must have been this very assembly of the Ācāryas of the Dakṣiṇāpatha held at the city of Mahimā (or Veṇākatatīpura) to which Dharasena is said to have sent his message. So Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali are proved to have been contemporaries not only of Dharasena but also of Arhadbali whose date is A.D. 38-66.

An old catalogue of Jaina works, named the *Bṛhad-ṭippaṇikā* and dated A.D. 1383, mentions that Dharasena wrote a Prākṛt treatise on *Mantraśāstra*, by the name of *Joni-pāhuḍa*, in M.E. 600 (or A.D. 73).[1] No other Dharasena, either in the Digambara or the Śvetāmbara tradition, is known to have lived in those times, and this Dharasena is reputed to have been a great *mantra-vādi* as also a staunch supporter of Prākṛt.

Moreover, another Jaina tradition makes Bhūtabali identical with Nahapāna, the Śaka Kṣaharāta of Surāṣṭra.[2] According to our calculation he seems to have ascended the throne in A.D. 26, i.e., after the 100-year rule of the Gardabhillas which had commenced with the accession of Vikrama's father, the Gardabhilla of the *Kālakācārya Kathānaka* fame, in 74 B.C. Nahapāna is said to have ruled for 40 years, which would thus end in A. D. 66. This date exactly coincides with the last year of Arhadbali's pontificate when he seems to have had convened that great council of all the South Indian monks at the banks of the Veṇa. Incidentally, it was at this council that Arhadbali is said to have allowed the breaking up of the Mūla Saṁgha into several subdivisions

---

[1] *JSS*, I, No. 4, p. 157.

[2] See the *Srutāvatāra* of Bibudha Śrīdhara, which forms a chapter of the author's *Pañcādhikāra* and has been published in *Siddhāntasārādi Saṁgraha* (M.D.J.G., Bombay, v.s. 1979).

like the Nandi, Sena, Deva, Siṁha, Bhadra, etc.[1] So if there is any truth in the tradition which identifies Bhūtabali with Nahapāna, the latter, after his defeat at the hands of Gautamiputra Sātakarni, might have abdicated the throne and become a Jaina monk. He was a great monarch and must have been well educated. He might have been in his sixties when he became a Jaina monk Hence even though newly initiated he might have been considered quite capable for the important task of redacting the canon. Then, he was taught by such an eminent guru as Dharasena and was guided in his work by his senior colleague Puṣpadanta. The completion of the *Ṣaṭakhaṇḍāgama* by Bhūtabali is said to have taken place some considerable time after his meeting with Dharasena.

A tradition attributes a commentary, named *Parikarma*, on a part of this work to Padmanandi who is identified with Kundakunda. Another tradition attributes the same not to Kundakunda but to a disciple of his, named Kundakīrti. Kundakunda belongs to the first half of the first century A.D.

The Junagarh Jaina stone inscription[2], originally discovered in that very Candraguphā of Girinagar which tradition makes the abode of Dharasena, throws interesting light on the lower limit of the date of these redactors of the canon. The inscription is undated, but its author is mentioned as the great-grandson of Caṣṭana, the grandson of Jayadāman and the son of.....

---

[1] See the *Paṭṭāvali* and *Śrutāvatāras*, op. cit.; also *JSB*, I. 4, p. 69; IV. 4, p. 240; *IA*, XX, p. 346. Some modern scholars have erred in assigning this subdivision of the Mūla Saṁgha into several Saṁghas, Gaṇas, etc., to the 8th or 9th century A.D., for example, see B.A. Saletore's *MJ*, p. 235.

[2] *EI*, X, App. (ii), Southern Inscs. No. 966.

(name missing). There is no doubt that it must have been Rudradāman. The name of the author is also missing, but he too seems to be none else than Damajadaśri, the son and successor of Rudradāman, who succeeded his father about S.E. 72 (or A.D. 150). The inscription further informs that the place was sanctified by the *Samādhimaraṇa* (ideal mode of death for Jaina ascetics) of some one who had obtained the knowledge of the Kevalins, which event had been celebrated by Deva-Asura-Nāga-Yakṣa, etc. The last statement clearly indicates that the event referred to must have taken place some considerable time before the date of the inscription for, otherwise, how could the tradition take such a legendary character.

Lastly, the finalisation of the schism which divided the so long apparently united Jaina Saṁgha into two permanent sects, the Digambara and the Śvetāmbara, is said to have taken place, according to the tradition of the former, in A.D. 79[1] at the city of Valabhī, and, according to the tradition of the latter, in A.D. 82 at

[1] छत्तीसे वारिससये विक्कमरायमरणपत्तस्स।
सोरठे बलहीए उप्पणो सेवडो सघो॥
—*Darśanasāra*, v. 7.

सषट्त्रिंशे शतेऽब्दानामृते विक्रमराजनि।
सौराष्ट्रे वल्लभीपुर्यामभूत्तत्कथ्यतेमया॥
—*Bhāvasaṁgraha*, v. 188.

धृतानि श्वेतवासांसि तद्दिनात्समजायत।
श्वेताम्बर मतख्याततोर्द्धफालकमताक्ष॥
मृते विक्रम भूपालेषट्त्रिंशदधिकेशते।
गतेऽब्दानामभूल्लोकेमतश्वेताम्बराभिधम।
—*Bhadrabāhu-carita*, LIV. 4-5.

The last reference also hints that the forerunner of the Śvetāmbaras were the Ardhaphālakas (partially-clad ascetics) which is curiously corroborated by some Jaina sculptures (naked ascetics with a piece of cloth hanging from their arm in front) belonging to Śuṅga, Śaka and Kusana times, discovered from Mathura and preserved in the museums at Mathura and Lucknow.

Rahavīrapura.[1] It is obvious that the redaction of the Digambara canon by Dharasena, Bhūtabali, etc., as also the reorganization of the South Indian congregation, the members of which had begun to call themselves as belonging to the Mūla or original Jaina Saṁgha, into several divisions like the Nandi, Sena, etc., must have constituted the most potent and immediate causes of this irretrievable cleavage.

Dharasena may be safely assigned to *circa* A.D. 40-75, Puṣpadanta to *circa* A.D. 50-80 and Bhūtabali to *circa* A.D. 66-90, and the completion of the *Ṣaṭakhaṇḍāgama* by the latter to *circa* A.D. 75.

The other redactor of the canon, Guṇadhara, is believed to have lived even before Dharasena.[2] With his work are associated the names of Āryamaṅkhu, Nāgahasti and Yativṛṣabha. The *Śrutāvatāras* seem to make them all more or less contemporaries. But much older and more authentic works like the *Dhavala* and *Jayadhavala* leave no doubt as regards the fact that Āryamaṅkhu lived sometime after the death of Guṇadhara and that he obtained the latter's *sūtras* through his own gurus.[3] And although Āryamaṅkhu and Nāgahasti are generally mentioned together the relation between the two is also not clear. They might have been separated by some interval. As a matter of fact these two gurus are also owned by the Śvetāmbaras and mentioned in their *Paṭṭāvalis*, one of which gives the

---

[1] छव्वास सयाइ नवुत्तराइतइया सिद्धिगयस्सवीरस्स।
तो बोडिआण दिट्ठि रहवीरपुरे समुप्पन्ना॥
—*Āvaśyaka Mūlabhāṣya*, v. 145.

[2] *JSB*, III. 4, p. 132.

[3] पुणो ताओ चेयसुत्त गाथाओ आइरिय परपराए आगच्छमाणाओ अज्जमंखु णागहत्थीण पत्ताओ। —*Jayadhavala*, I, introd., p. 46, etc.

date of Āryamaṅkhu as M.E. 450 (or 77 B.C.) and another as M.E. 467 (or 60 B.C.). They place Nāgahasti 130 or 150 years after Āryamaṅkhu, which would mean between A.D. 53 and 90. But some other *Paṭṭāvalis* assign Nāgahasti to V.E. 151-219 (or A.D. 94-162).[1] Moreover, Yativṛṣabha is invariably made to be an immediate disciple or junior colleague (*antevāsī*) of Nāgahasti[2], and he cannot be placed much before A.D. 176. The Sarasvatī inscription from Mathura, already referred to, curiously mentions the name of Nāgahasti. The inscription mentions that the image was set up at the instance of one Āryadeva the disciple or junior colleague (*śraddhācāro*) of Nāgahasti. The same two gurus in the same manner have been mentioned in another inscription found in the same place.[3] The latter is dated in the year 52, while the former in 54. In both these inscriptions the name in question has no doubt been read as Māgahasti, but considering their age, mutilated condition and the paleography of the Brāhmī script the original could have been Nāgahasti. The teacher of this Nāgahasti is named in these inscriptions as Hastahasti which itself is synonymous with Nāgahasti. The epithets, Ārya, Gaṇi and Vācaka, used for the guru in these inscriptions are exactly those which are found used for him in literary tradition. As his name is not found in any regular succession list of either the Digambaras or the Śvetāmbaras and as he appears to have originally belonged to the north rather than the south, together with the fact that he

[1] See *Paṭṭāvali Samuccaya*, ed. Darśana Vijaya. Also Introduction to *Jayadbavala*, Vol. I.

[2] जो अज्जमखुसीसो अतेवासी विणागहत्थिस्स
—*Jayadbavala*, op.. cit., introd., p. 46.

[3] *EI*, X, App. No. 53 (Luders).

is owned by both the sects, there is every possibility of his having belonged to Mathura which, though a premier centre of Jainism in those days, was still free from the pernicious influence of schismatic tendencies. Moreover, the fact that his name is found inscribed on the image of the Sarasvatī clearly indicates his active association with the Sarasvatī movement of which, being a redactor of the canon itself, he must have been an important leader. Hence if these inscriptions are taken to be connected with that Nāgahasti (who may be identical with either Māgahasti or Hastahasti) the later date (i.e., A.D. 130-132) would be the correct date and incidentally it would fix the date of Nāgahasti as well. Allowing for a reasonable interval between him and Āryamankhu before him, the latter would seem to belong to *circa* A.D. 50, and similarly Gunadhara to about the beginning of the 1st century A.D. (or *circa* A.D. 25). Thus within half a century (A.D. 25-75) the surviving Digambara canonical knowledge was finally reduced to writing.

It is obvious that this redaction was not done on a sudden impulse. There must have been a long, persistent and widespread agitation against the conservative orthodoxy of the custodians of canonical knowledge. For some two centuries after Mahāvīra they felt no need of books, but when in later times they began to feel it the notion that it would be a sacrilege had taken deep roots. The times were, however, changing. If, on the one hand, the traditional canonical knowledge continued to decline, on the other, schismatic tendencies and disintegrating elements began to appear and gather force as time went on. At the same time, the increasing contacts with the outside world through the Greeks, the Parthians and the Scythians,

and the presence as well as intermingling of these materialistic races in Indian society, gave impetus to the art of writing. The representation of a Śaka as devotee of the Jaina Sarasvatī is not without significance. Moreover, it was the age of Patañjali, Vālmīki, Sauti and Vātsyāyana who were producing valuable and voluminous works on Brahmanical religion, philosophy and sacred lore. And just then in Ceylon attempts were being made to finally redact the Buddhist Pāli texts. In the Jaina world, efforts at compromise between the schismatic sections were proving a failure and prominent persons both among the monks as well as the laity had long realised the imperative need of writing down their religious doctrines and traditions. The Jainas of Mathura seem to have taken a leading part in sponsoring this movement. But the origin of the Sarasvatī movement seems to go back at least up to the time of King Khāravela of Kaliṅga. From lines 14-16 of his Hāthīgumphā inscription[1], wherein he gives an account of his doings in the 13th year of his reign, we learn that in that year he caused to be built on the Kumārī Parvata in Suparvata-Vijaya Cakra (province) the Nisidyās in memory of those Arhats who had attained liberation, so as to be worshipped by his loyal subjects. For the shelter and abode of ascetics he caused caves to be excavated. Near the Arhat Niṣidyā he caused to be constructed a big and fine audience hall, in the centre of which a costly pillar (Māna-stambha) was erected. All the Śramaṇas, the Jaina ascetics and monks, from far off places, were invited to assemble there. And in that assembly, obviously at the instance of the king, efforts

[1] *JBORS*, III, pp. 425-472.

were made to restore and give a reading (उपादयति) of the surviving or declining (वोछिन) knowledge of the peace-giving twelve Angas (चोयठि अंग सतिकं) which had emanated from the Divyadhvani (मुखियकल) of the Tīrthaṁkara. And that great king put questions about (पसतो), listened to (सुनतो) and meditated upon (अनुभवतो) these scriptures (कलानानि).[1] Opinions differ about the date of Khāravela, though there is a probability of his having lived in the 2nd century B.C. Thus we may safely assign the beginnings of the Sarasvatī movement to the middle of the 2nd century B.C.

For about a century the movement seemed to bear no fruit, but towards the end of the 1st century B.C. it gathered momentum and in the several decades just before and after the beginning of the Christian era there were a number of Jaina saint-scholars, both in the north and the south, who did their utmost to make the movement a success. They acted as pioneers of Jaina literary activity, but were not identical with the redactors of the canon. And though they did not consider themselves authorised to undertake the redaction of the canonical works they did not wait for that redaction by others either and applied themselves to writing down valuable treatises and works on Jaina metaphysics, philosophy, ethics, traditional lore and so on, on the basis of that knowledge which had been handed down to them through the succession of eminent gurus, or which was available

---

[1] We have followed the accepted reading and generally the accepted interpretation except in the last portion (line 16):

'वोछिन (व्युच्छिन्न) च चोयठि (चौ+अठि=१२) अग सतिक (शान्तिक) तुरिय (त्वयँ) उपादयति (उपाध्यति)'

For Khāravela's convening a Jaina religious conference for the restoration of scriptures, see also *JBORS*, XIII, pt. 3-4, pp. 233-35, 244.

to them in the circle of scholarly monks of their times. Their literary efforts made the redaction only a question of time, and it was speedily undertaken. By the beginning of the 2nd century A.D. the Sarasvatī movement was an accomplished fact. The Śvetāmbara section, as it came to be called after the 1st century A.D., still continued to resist the movement for some four centuries more, but finally it also had to concede to the demands of time.

The Sarasvatī movement, particularly the period (*circa* 50 B.C.—A.D. 50) when it was at its zenith, therefore, marks the actual beginning of the Jaina literary history and of the Jaina literary sources of Indian history.

CHAPTER VII

THE PIONEERS AND EARLY AUTHORS

KUNDAKUNDA is the most celebrated name in the literary history of Jainism. He was not only the most zealous pioneer of the Sarasvatī movement, but was also perhaps the earliest and the greatest Jaina author of that age. Even his name has an auspicious significance.[1] He has been regarded as the foremost leader of the Mūla Samgha[2] and his own lineage (i.e., Kundakundānvaya) with its many subsequent branches and sub-branches spread far and wide. To trace their spiritual lineage from Kundakunda has been looked upon as a proud privilege by Jaina monks of the Digambara section, as many as three major Samghas being known to have this Anvaya.[3] He is also reputed to have established the superiority of Jaina scriptures and to have made them popular all over the Bharatakṣetra.[4] Many later authors are greatly indebted to him and some of his works have proved to be a milch-cow for later commentators for quotations. Most of his utterances are above sectarianism, and his *Samayasāra*

---

[1] For example the popular Jaina benedictory verse runs as:

मगलम् भगवान वीरो, मगलम् गौतमोगणी ।
मगलम् कुन्दकुन्दाद्या:, जैनधर्मोस्तु मगलम् ।।

[2] श्रीमतो वर्धमानस्य वर्धमानस्य शासने ।
श्री कौन्डकुन्दनामाभूं मूलसघाग्रणीगणी ।।
—*EC*, II. 69.

[3] *EC*, II, Nos. 64, 66, 69, 117, 127, 140, 254, 258; ibid., VIII, Nos. 35, 36, 37, etc.

[4] वन्द्यो विभुर्भुविन कैरिहकौण्डकुन्द:कुन्दप्रभा-प्रणयि-कीर्त्ति-विभूषिताश : ।
यश्चारु चारणकराम्बुज चञ्चरीकश्चक्रे श्रुतस्य भरतेप्रयत: प्रतिष्ठाम् ।।
—Sravaṇa Belgola Inscs. No. 54.

in particular is studied with devotion by the Digambaras, the Śvetāmbaras and the Sthānakavāsis alike and even by some non-Jainas.

In later works and inscriptions he is mentioned by several names. The epigraphic records generally give his name as Koṇḍa-Kunda, Kundakunda being the Sanskrit form of the same. Devasena (A.D. 933) and Jayasena (*c.* A.D. 1150) refer to him as Padmanandi.[1] Several inscriptions and writers of the 14th century and onwards mention that he was also known as Vakragrīva, Gṛddhapiccha and Elācārya.[2] Mahāmati[3] and Vaṭṭakera[4] have also been suggested as his other names. He himself, however, gives little information; only at the end of one of his many works, viz., the *Bārasa Anuvekkhā*, he gives his name as Kundakunda, and at the end of another work, *Bodhapāhuḍa*, he tells us that it is the composition of the disciple of Bhadrabāhu.[5]

Some traditional biographical accounts of this scholar are also available, but they are all of a rather legendary character and deserve little or no credit.[6] Similarly, popular tradition attributes to him many

---

[1] vide., A.N. Upadhye's introd. to *Pravacanasāra* (Bombay, 1935), p. 2.

[2] ibid., pp. 2-4.

[3] A. Guerinot, *Rapertoire d'Epigraphie Jaina*, No. 585. But the term meaning 'of great wisdom' seems to be an adjective rather than a proper name.

[4] J. P. Jain, 'Some more Aliases of Kundakunda', *JA*, XII. 2, pp. 19-23.

[5] सद्दवियारो हूओ भासा सुत्तेसु ज जिणेकहिय।
सो तहकहिय णाय सीसेण य भद्दबाहुस्स॥
—*Bodhapābuḍa* (in *Ṣaṭ-prābhṛtādi-samgraha*, M.D.J.G. No. 17, Bombay).

[6] See Upadhye, op. cit., p. 6; Chakravarti, *Pañcāstikāya* (S.B.J., Allahabad, 1920), Introd., p. vii, etc.

miraculous powers about the truth of which nothing can be said.[1]

As regards his teachers, he himself says that he was the disciple of Bhadrabāhu. His commentator Jayasena (A.D. 1150) informs that the name of Kundakunda's guru was Kumāranandi[2], while a *Paṭṭāvalī* of the Nandi Saṁgha says he was the disciple of Jinacandra, the disciple of Māghanandi who was, in his turn, the disciple of Arhadbali.[3] Of these three sources, the *Paṭṭāvalī* is the latest in date and like other records of this nature seems to have been regularised in much later times. As regards Kumāranandi, one guru of this name has been mentioned in an early Mathura inscription.[4] As to which of the two Bhadrabāhus is meant by Kundakunda, there is a controversy[5], but it appears that it must have been Bhadrabāhu II (37-14 B.C.).

As regards the question of his domicile, there is no doubt that he belonged to the South. His very name, Koṇḍakunda appears to be Dravidian and looks like the name of a Kannada town or village.[6] The personal use of such pen-names was regular in the Dravidian area, and several Jaina gurus are known to have borne such names, e. g., Tumbalūrācārya from village Tumbalūra. Later writers specifically mention that he belonged to

---

[1] ibid. The commentaries on his works and other later works and inscriptions have popularised these legends.

[2] In the opening remarks of his commentary on *Pañcāstikāya*.

[3] cf., *JSB*, I. 4, p. 78.

[4] *EI*, X, App. (Luders), No. 71.

[5] cf., Upadhye, op. cit., pp. 16-17, and *PJVS* (Sarsawa, 1950), introd., p. 14.

[6] F. W. Thomas's introd. (p. 15) to *Pravacanasāra*, translated by B. Faddegan (Cambridge, 1935).

the town of Koṇḍakunda[1], and there still exists a village of this name about 4 or 5 miles from Guntakal railway station, which is associated with the life of Kundakunda. He is said to have performed penance in the nearby cave.[2] A similar tradition connects him with the Nandi hill.[3]

The date of Kundakunda has been a baffling problem. A number of modern scholars have discussed it and it varies from the 4th century B.C. to the 6th century A.D.[4] Popular tradition, however, states that he succeeded to the pontifical seat in V.S. 49 (or 8 B.C.) at the age of 33, lived as a teacher for 52 years and passed away in A.D. 44 at the age of 85.[5] He seems to have been a contemporary of Bhadrabāhu II and Arhadbali. The dates of these gurus are slightly different in different *Paṭṭāvalis* and the upper and lower limits come to be 53 B.C. and A.D. 66 respectively. He certainly seems to have lived not only before the schism of A.D. 79 but also before the division of the Mūla Samgha into its Nandi, Sena, Simha and other branches, as also before the redaction of the canon, at least by Dharasena and Bhūtabali (*c.* A.D. 75). In literary as well as epigraphical tradition he is invariably placed before Umāsvāmi and Samantabhadra. Pūjyapāda

---

[1] For example, his commentator Bālacandra (A.D. 1176), and Indranandi in his *Śrutāvatāra* (10th century). Also see *JSB*, XX. 3, p. 16; ibid., XIX. 2.

[2] Upadhye, op. cit.

[3] See Rice, *EC*, X, introd., pp. 9-10; also Saletore, *MJ*, p. 256.

[4] F. W. Thomas, op. cit., p. 14; K.B. Pathak, *IA*, XIV, p. 15, etc.; Upadhye, op. cit.; N. R. Premi, *Jaina Jagata*, VIII. 4; J.K. Mukhtar, *Svāmi Samantabhadra*, p. 158, etc.; Gajadhara Lal, *Samayasāra* (Banaras, 1914), introd.; Chakravarti, op. cit.

[5] Peterson's Report for 1883-84, Vol. II, pp. 163-166; Hoernle, *IA*, XX, pp. 341-361.

(*circa* A.D. 500) who is the well-known commentator of Umāsvāmi's work and who mentions and quotes from Samantabhadra, also quotes from Kundakunda. The dates of prominent Jaina gurus and authors who came after Kundakunda make it almost a certainty that he must have lived prior to A.D. 50. Prof. Chakravarti assigns him to the 1st century A.D. and Dr. Upadhye also, after a thorough discussion of the different views and available material, arrives at about the same date. The Prākṛt dialect used by Kundakunda in his works also corroborates this view. The Mathura inscription referred to above, which mentions Kumāranandi whom tradition associates with Kundakunda, is dated in the year 87. The figure is a bit doubtful and might be 67, and as there is nothing in the inscription to connect it with the Kuṣaṇa period it might well have been dated in the E.S.E. of 66 B.C., which would place Kumāranandi about the beginning of the Christian era. Dr. R.G. Bhandarkar describes Kundakunda as one of the earliest Digambara authors whose works are referred to by subsequent writers[1], and Peterson styles him as a teacher of great antiquity and renown.[2] In fact, Kundakunda refers to no previous author or work, obviously because there were none. He leaves no doubt as to his place in relation to the Jaina canon and always refers to it in general terms. The traditional aspect of his work is clear from the fact that his works have some verses common with some texts of the Śvetāmbara canon; being common property in early days, they have been preserved by both the sections independently.[3] All this shows that he may safely

[1] Bhandarkar's Report for 1883-84, p. 430.
[2] Peterson's Report for 1883-84, p. 80.
[3] vide., Upadhye's introduction, op. cit.

be assigned to the early part of the 1st century A.D. or, to be exact, to 8 B.C.—A.D. 44.

Kundakunda is reputed to have written 84 *Pāhuḍas* or big and small tracts in Prākṛt, mainly based on whatever traditional textual knowledge he had inherited from early teachers. His works contain allusions to non-Jaina matters also. Sometimes he makes allusion to persons who lived in the past and they might be historical.[1]

The most well-known and available works of Kundakunda are :—

1. *Samayasāra.*
2. *Pravacanasāra.*
3. *Pañcāstikāyasāra.*

These three works together are also known as *Prābhṛtatraya* or *Sāratraya* on the analogy of the *Prasthānatraya* of the Vedantists and are as much sacred and authoritative for the Jainas.

4. *Niyamasāra.*
5. *Rayaṇasāra,*
6. *Aṣṭa-pāhuḍa,* a collection of Kundakunda's 8 works. Some of these *Pāhuḍas* are found to contain useful bits of historical information. Some more *Pāhuḍas* are also known to have been discovered.[2]
7. *Bārasa-aṇuvekkhā.*
8. *Daśabhakti,* also contains many Jaina traditions.
9. *Mūlācāra,* one of the earliest and most authentic texts in Prākṛt on the theory and practice of Jaina asceticism. It was till lately regarded as the work of some Vaṭṭakera, but recently some new evidence

[1] ibid.

[2] The *Ṣaṭ-prābhṛtādi-saṃgraha* (M.D.J.G., Bombay) is a collection of ten *Pāhuḍas.*

has shown that the latter was probably none else than Kundakunda himself.[1]

10. *Kural* or *Tirukkural*, the most popular Tamil classic, also known as the *Tamil Veda* and highly admired all over the world, is also attributed by tradition to Kundakunda, his another name being Elācārya. It is said that after composing it he gave the work to his disciple Tiruvalluvar who introduced it to the Saṅgama at Madura.[2] It appears that the Sarasvatī movement also marked the beginnings of Tamil literature and it is very likely that the Jaina ascetic scholars of the South took a leading part in the literary activity of the early Tamil Saṅgama. The authorship of *Tolkappiyam*, the earliest Tamil grammar which seems to have preceded even the *Kural*, is also attributed to a Jaina.[3] No wonder that Kundakunda who was the foremost leader of the South Indian Jaina congregation, a great author and a Dravidian by birth, was associated with the early literary activity in Tamil also.

11. *Parikarma*, a commentary on a part of the redacted canon, is also attributed to Kundakunda by one *Śrutāvatāra*[4], but another source of equal standing attributes it not to him but to a disciple of his by name Kundakīrti.[5]

Svami Kumara is the author of *Kārttikeya-anuprekṣā* (489 verses), a fine and popular didactic work

---

[1] cf., *JA*, XII. 2, pp. 19-23.

[2] vide., Upadhye, op.cit., pp. 20-21; Chakravarti, op. cit., and his *Jaina Literature in Tamil* (Arrah, 1941), pp. 14-19; also see *JA*, XII, p. 20.

[3] *Jaina Literature in Tamil*, pp. 10-12.

[4] i.e., of Indranandi.

[5] i.e., of Bibudha Śridhara, and it seems to be nearer the truth.

in Prākṛt.[1] In this work allusions to many past personages cited as examples of noble character or of ideal deeds are found, which are also repeated by other early writers and which were later on developed into regular stories in the *Kathākoṣas*.[2] There is, however, a controversy as regards the name of the author. Some scholars, misled by the statements of his only available commentator Śubhacandra (A.D. 1556), came to believe that his name was Kārttikeya.[3] But the author himself specifically mentions his name as Kumāra and nowhere as Kārttikeya.[4] It is just possible that the Kumāranandi of the Mathura inscription (A.D. 1 or 21) referred to in the previous context was this Svāmi Kumāra.[5] The work is admittedly of an ancient character and scholars are not generally inclined to assign it to much later than the 1st century A.D.[6] Some of its verses are common with those of Kundakunda and Śivārya, although he differs from them in the treatment of his subject. It shows that all of them derived their knowledge from an older and common source. Like other pioneers

---

[1] See *Cat. Mss. in C.P. & Berar* (Hiralal), p. xiv; Winternitz, *A Hist. of Indian Lit.*, II, p. 577. The work has also been edited and published by Pannalal Bakliwala, Bombay.

[2] viz., Story of Kārttikeya Muni in Hariṣena's *Kathākoṣa*, (Bombay, 1943).

[3] 'कार्त्तिकेयानुप्रेक्षाष्टीका वक्ष्ये शुभश्रिये, अह श्री कार्त्तिकेय साधुः सस्तुवे,'

(MS. dated A.D. 1749, Delhi Naya Mandir). It may be because Kārttikeya and Kumāra are often used as synonyms.

[4] जिणवयणभावणटठं सामिकुमारेण परम सद्धाए।

रइया अणुपेक्खाओ चचल मणरुभणट्ठं च ॥४८७॥

and तिहुयण पहाण सामिकुमार कालेवित विय तवयरण. . . .,etc.

[5] *EI*, X, App. No. 71. Moreover, no other guru of that name is known to have existed in or about those times.

[6] *PJVS*, Hindi introd., p. 26.

he also asserts that his source was the traditional *Jinā-gama*.[1]

Śɪᴠᴀʀʏᴀ is the author of the *Ārādhanā*, also called *Mūla-ārādhanā* or *Bhagavatī-ārādhanā*, which is a very important and ancient Prākṛt text (2,166 verses) mainly dealing with the conduct of Jaina ascetics.[2] It is believed to have been the ultimate source of the Jaina Kathākosa literature which is represented by the *Kathākosas* of Hariṣeṇa (A.D. 931), Prabhācandra (A.D. 980), Śrīcandra (A.D. 1066), Brahma Nemidatta, Rāmacandra, etc., and which forms one of the principal streams of Jaina historical tradition. The language of the *Ārādhanā* is Śaurasenī Prākṛt but adulterated with a large percentage of Ardhamāgadhī words.[3] A number of Prākṛt, Sanskrit and Kannada commentaries were written on this work[4], which tried, in their respective ways, to develop the stories from the seeds thereof contained in the *Ārādhanā*[5], and these stories were later on given a regular form by the *Kathākosas*. The earliest available commentary is the *Vijayodayā-ṭīkā* in Sanskrit written by Aparājita Sūri, also known as Śrīvijaya (*c.* A.D. 700), but it is not the first as it itself refers to older commentaries.[6]

The only information about the author of the *Ārādhanā* is that which he himself supplies (in vv. 2161-

[1] 'बारस अणुपेक्खाओ भणियाहु जिणागमाणुसारेण', v. 488.

[2] Published with Sanskrit commentaries and Hindi translation from Solapur (1935); also by N.R. Premi, Bombay.

[3] C.D. Chatterji, 'Early Life of Chandragupta Maurya, from Jaina Sources', *B.C. Law Volume*, Pt. I, pp. 590-610, and A.N. Upadhye, *Bṛhat-kathākoṣa* (Bombay, 1943), introd., p. 50.

[4] Premi's introduction to Bombay edition, op. cit.; also *Anekānta*, I. 3, p. 145; *JSB*, V. 3, pp. 129-34; Upadhye, op. cit.

[5] For example, Kannada *Vaḍḍārādhane*, see *Summaries* of A.I.O.C., Lucknow, 1951, p. 188.

[6] *JSB*, V. 3, pp. 129-134.

66) at the end of his work: "Pāṇitalabhojī Śivārya, having mastered the Mūla Sūtras at the feet of Ārya Jinanandi Gaṇī, Ārya Sarvagupta Gaṇī and Ārya Mitranandi Gaṇī wrote this *Ārādhanā* to the best of his ability, in accordance with older texts." The term 'Pāṇitalabhojī' is distinctively a Digambara epithet used for their ascetics. Some scholars, however, think he might have been a Yāpanīya.[1] This sect, though more allied to the Digambara, acted as a sort of intermediary and reconciliatory section between the two sects, particularly in the early days of the schism.

The date of Śivārya and his work has not yet been definitely fixed. The following facts, however, point to the beginning of the Christian era.

He mentions no scholar or guru belonging to the 1st century and onwards, but some of his verses are common with those in *Mūlācāra* and the Śvetāmbara canonical texts.

Besides his three gurus he also mentions Bhadrabāhu who is said to have died peacefully in spite of great suffering (v. 1544). It obviously indicates Bhadrabāhu II (*c.* 37-14 B.C.). The way in which the incident is related seems to indicate an intimate knowledge of this fact on the part of the author.[2]

Kundakunda in *Bhāvapāhuda* (v. 53) mentions a saint Śivabhūti.

The Śvetāmbara *Mūlabhāṣya* (v. 148) and the *Kalpasūtra-sthavirāvalī* inform that the original founder of the Boṭika Saṁgha (or the Digambara sect) was one

---

[1] See *Anekānta*, III, p. 59, etc.; *JSI*, Bombay, 1942, pp. 40-41.

[2] औमोदरिए घोराए भद्दबाहु असकिलिट्ठमही।
घोराए विगिछाए पडिवण्णो उत्तम ठाण ॥१५४४॥

Śivabhūti.[1]

The Śrutāvatāra tradition speaks of four Ārātīya Yatis soon after Bhadrabāhu II, and one of them was Śivadatta. Pūjyapāda (*c.* A.D. 450) speaks of the Ārātīyas as on par with the Śrutakevalins[2], whereas Aparājita (*c.* A.D. 700), the commentator of the *Ārādhanā*, speaks of himself and of his gurus as 'Ārātīya-Sūri-Cūḍāmaṇi.'

The prefix Ārya and the suffix Gaṇi used by Śivārya with the names of his gurus are quite similar to those used in the Mathura inscriptions of the Śuṅga-Śaka-Kuṣāṇa period. After the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. no such instances are available. All things about the author point to his being a northerner.

In the 40th chapter of his work he speaks of a peculiar form of funeral which shows that the dead body used to be left away in some open space in the forest to be disposed of by birds and beasts. The Greeks of Alexander's time found this practice prevailing in a tribe named Oreitai which lived in south-western Sindh.[3] The marked similarity between the terms Ārātīya and 'Oreitai' may not be without significance.

Some scholars are of opinion that, in view of the linguistic and textual evidence, the *Ārādhanā* should be assigned to the 1st century A.D.[4]

Hence, there is a possibility that Śivārya, the author of the *Mūlārādhanā*, is identical with saint Śivabhūti of the Śvetāmbara tradition. He seems to have belonged to the north, probably Mathura, and to have resided

---

[1] Dr. Hiralal Jain identifies him with Śivārya, vide., 'Śivabhūti and Śivārya', *Nagpur University Journal*, No. 9.

[2] *Sarvārthasiddhi*, 1. 20.

[3] McCrindle, *Indika*, p. 297.

[4] C.D. Chatterjee, op. cit.

for some time in western Sindh. Like Kundakunda he seems to have been a zealous pioneer of the Sarasvatī movement, but, unlike the former, Śivārya seems to have belonged to that section of the Jaina monks of those days who tried their best to avert the impending schism. He may thus be assigned to the first half of the 1st century A.D.[1]

VIMALA SURI, the author of the *Paum-cariu*[2], the first and earliest available Jaina version of the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, composed this work, according to his own statement, in M.E. 530 (or A.D. 3).[3] The oldest available manuscript is a palm-leaf one dated V.E. 1198 (or A.D. 1141), written in Broach in the reign of Jaisimhadeva.[4] The earliest known reference to the work and its author is found in the *Kuvalayamālā* of Udyotanasūri (A.D. 778)[5], but the *Padmacarita* of Raviseṇa (A.D. 676) is almost a Sanskrit rendering of the present work, in parts literal and at places unnecessarily elaborate.[6] Eminent Orientalists and Prakritists like Peterson, Jacobi, Woolner, Keith, Winternitz,

---

[1] J. P. Jain, 'Sivārya the Author of Bhagavatī Ārādhana', (Hindi), *Premi Volume* (1946), pp. 425-428.

[2] Published by Jain Dharma Prasaraka Sabha, Bhavanagar; also Ch. I-IV, by V.M. Shah (Surat, 1936.)

[3] पचेव वाससया दुसमाए तीसवरस सजुत्ता।
वीरे सिद्धिमुवगए तओ निबद्ध इमचरिय॥

—Last chapter, v. 103.

[4] Catalogue of Jesselmere Bhaṇḍāra, p. 17.

[5] जारिसय विमलंको विमलको तारिसं लहइ अत्थ।
अमयमइय व सरसं सरस चियपाइय जस्स॥३६॥
बुहयण सहस्स दइयं हरिवसुप्पत्ति कारय पढमं।
वदामि वदिय पिहु हरिवस चेव विमल पयं॥३८॥

The second verse shows that Vimala was also the author of the first *Harivaṁśa*. Unfortunately this work has not yet been discovered.

[6] Published by M.D.J.G., Bombay, V.E. 1985.

Leumann and Dhruva, have taken notice of this work and they do not doubt its being prior to Ravişeņa's work.[1] The other Jaina version of this story as found in the *Mahāpurāņa* of Guņabhadra (9th century) and which has been adopted by several later writers differs materially from that of *Paum-cariu*, but it could never attain the same popularity. Ravişeņa by his Sanskrit work and after him Svayambhu (8th century) by his Apabhraṁśa *Rāmāyaņa* made Vimala's version the most popular one. It is also nearer to Vālmīki's version. In fact, he seems to have been inspired by the latter's example in writing down the story in accordance with the Jaina tradition, as he himself hints that he wrote his work in order to dispel the misconceptions created by untruthful accounts contained in some work which was then gaining popularity.[2] Some scholars have found it an interesting linguistic study[3], while others have tried to trace in it the influences of Greek and Roman contacts with ancient Indian culture.[4] Besides representing perhaps an independent and, in many respects, a different stream of tradition relating to the times of Rāma and Rāvaņa, it also as an epic poem and a narrative throws useful light on the condition of society in the early centuries of the Christian era.

Some scholars, however, have raised doubts as regards the date of this work and have variously placed

---

[1] See *Anekānta*, V. 1-2, pp. 38-48.

[2] अलियपि सव्वमेय उववत्ति विरुद्ध पच्चयगुणेहिं।
न य सद्दहति पुरिसा हवति जे पडिया लोए॥

—*Pauma.*, II. 117.

[3] vide., Dr. A.M. Ghatge's paper, A.I.O.C., Lucknow, 1951, p. 116.

[4] cf., Keith's *A History of Sanskrit Literature*.

it in the 3rd, 4th or 5th and even the 6th century A.D.[1] But scholars like Leumann, Winternitz and N.R. Premi see no reason why the date given by the author himself should not be believed.[2]

There has also been some controversy on the point of the author's sect. Both the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras are equally able to find such material in the work which corresponds to their particular beliefs and traditions as against those of the other sect. It evidently shows that the author must have lived before the final separation and formation of these sects. He himself leaves no doubt as to the fact that there existed no previous work on the subject and that his sources were the traditions contained in the *Nāmāvalis* which had been handed down to him through a succession of gurus.[3] He also informs us that he was the disciple of Vijayācārya who belonged to the Nāila family and was the disciple of Rāhū.[4] In the *Paṭṭāvalis*, some other gurus belonging to the 2nd or 3rd century are said to have belonged to the same family of ascetics.[5] Lastly, in the *puṣpikā* at the end of the work the author

———

[1] For example, Jacobi assigns him to 3rd century A.D (*Encl. of Rel. & Ethics*, VII, p. 437; see also his article in *Mod. Rev.*, Dec. 1914, p. 575) and K.B. Dhruva to 6th century A.D. (*Introduction to Prakrit*).

[2] See Winternitz's *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II; N.R. Premi's article in *Anekānta*, V. 1-2, pp. 38-48; *JSI* (2nd ed.), p. 91, V. M. Shah's introd. to *Paum-cariu*, op. cit.

[3] णामावलि निबद्ध आयरिय परपरागय सव्व ।
वोच्छामि पउमचरिय अहाणु पुव्विसमासेण ॥ (I. 8.)

and एय वीरजिणेण रामचरिय . विल्लेण सुत्तसहिय गाहानिबद्ध कय . . . ., etc.

[4] राहू नामायरिओ स समय परसमय गहिय सब्भाओ ।
विजओय तस्स सीसो नाइलकुल वसनदियरो ॥ (I. 117.)

[5] See the *Nandisūtra Paṭṭāvali* in *Paṭṭāvali Samuccaya*.

is also styled as a Pūrvadhara, which means that he belonged to the times when the traditional canon by word of mouth still survived. All this points to the conclusion that the present author and his work could not belong to much later than the 1st century A.D., and that very probably the date given by himself is correct.

UMASVAMIN OR UMASVATI is another great pioneer of early times. He is held in high esteem both by the Digambaras as well as the Śvetāmbaras. If the former describe him as a 'Śrutakevalideśīya[1]', the latter call him a 'Pūrvavit' and 'Vācaka[2]', both meaning practically the same thing that this sage was one of those gurus of the pre-redaction days who were endowed with the rare privilege of having the direct knowledge of the traditional canon. His *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* (also called the *Mokṣaśāstra*) occupies in Jainism the same place as does the *Visuddhimagga* in Buddhism and is regarded as the most generally authoritative text outside the actual canon.[3] It is the first known Jaina work in Sanskrit and contains some 357 pithy *Sūtras* divided into 10 chapters.[4] A large number of commentaries by eminent scholars of both the sects have been written

---

[1] तत्त्वार्थसूत्र कर्त्तारमुमास्वाति मुनीश्वरम्।
श्रुतकेवलिदेशीय वन्देऽहं गुणमन्दिरम्॥
—*EC*, II Nr. 46.

[2] See *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, ed. Pt. Sukhlal (Banaras, 1952), introd., p. 17, f.n.; also *Anekānta*, V. 5, p. 180.

[3] The work has been translated into different languages and more than two dozen modern editions are available. More important ones are : J.L. Jaini's English translation (S.B.J., Lucknow); Pt. Sukhlal's Hindi ed., op. cit., also his Gujarati ed.; Pt. Kailash Chandra's Hindi ed. (Banaras, 1953).

[4] Hence it is also called the *Daśādhyāyī*.

on this work.[1] The earliest available Digambara commentary is the *Sarvārthasiddhi* of Pūjyapāda (*c.* A.D. 450) and the Śvetāmbara one is that of Siddhasenagaṇī (8th century). The Śvetāmbaras, however, attribute a *Bhāṣya* to the original author himself.[2] But no evidence of the existence of such a *Bhāṣya* prior to 8th century A.D. has yet been discovered. Maybe, as Prof. C.D. Chatterjee remarks, "It is another glaring instance of our credulousness which has given the credit of writing commentary on one's own work to more than one author, such as Kauṭilya, Dhanañjaya, Mahānāma, etc. If we ascribe the original commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* to its author Umāsvāmin disregarding the vital objections of the Digambaras, we shall be in no way creating precedent through it for the practice has been already well established by us."[3] In fact, the author scrupulously avoided the points disputed by the two sects and presented his work in the form acceptable by both, probably because he himself belonged to neither and lived before the finalisation of the schism. He appears to be one of those early gurus who tried to bring about a reconciliation and avert the separation.

Some traditional stories and miracles about this scholar are also current, but they are of a legendary character and not worthy of reliance.[4] The Śvetāmbaras have several different traditions relating to the name, *gotra*, *gaṇa*, gurus, date, etc., of this author and place

---

1 Perhaps no other Jaina text has so many commentaries written on it.

2 Sukhlal's ed., op. cit., introd., p. 20; also see *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1903-5.

3 *B.C. Law Vol.*, Pt. I, f.n. 41; *Anekānta*, IX. 5, p. 211.

4 They are generally based on very late epigraphic or literary traditions.

him, on the one hand, as early as the 3rd century B.C. and, on the other, as late as the 4th century A.D. They also attribute to him the authorship of some 500 other works of which only a small Sanskrit work named *Praśamarati-prakarana* is said to exist today.[1]

The Digambara tradition, however, associates him with the Nandi Saṁgha of Kundakundānvaya. The *Paṭṭāvali* of that Saṁgha informs that he succeeded Kundakunda himself in A.D. 44.[2] In literature as well as inscriptions, he is invariably mentioned just after Kundakunda and before Samantabhadra. Sometimes he is described as a disciple of and sometimes as born in or belonging to the line of Kundakunda.[3] The influence of Kundakunda's works and of the redacted canonical texts has been traced in his *Tattvārtha*.[4] A verse usually found at the end of his work and also quoted therefrom in several inscriptions mentions 'Gṛddhapiccha' as a soubriquet of Umāsvāmin.[5] A tradition attributes the fabulous *Gandhahasti-Mahābhāṣya* commentary on the *Tattvārtha* to Samantabhadra (2nd century A.D.).[6] The earliest available commentaries on the *Tattvārtha* are all by Digambara scholars of repute, viz., Pūjyapāda (5th century), Akalaṅka (7th century) and Vidyānanda (8th century).

Therefore, there remains little doubt that Umā-

---

[1] See introd. to Sukhlal's ed., op. cit.

[2] *JSB*, I. 4, p. 78.

[3] Śravana Belgola Inscriptions (Rice, Mysore Inscs., *EC* II), Nos. 255, 285, 323, 363, 388, 596, 625.

[4] See *JSB*, XI. 2, *Anekānta*, IV. 1, 11-12; V. 1-2.

[5] तत्त्वार्थशास्त्रकर्त्तार गृध्रपिच्छोपलक्षितम् ।
वन्दे गणीन्द्र सजातमुमास्वामी मुनीश्वरम् ॥

—*Tattvārtha Praśasti*, v. 1, *EC*, II, Sr. Bg. Inscs. 64, 127, 258.

[6] J.K. Mukhtar, *Svāmi Samantabhadra* (M.D.J.G., Bombay, V.E. 1985), pp. 214-220.

svāmin and his *Tattvārtha* belong to the latter half of the 1st or beginning of the 2nd century A.D. A comparative study of Umāsvāmin's *Tattvārthasūtra* with the *Sūtras* of Kapila, Kaṇāda, Gautama, Patañjali, Jaimini and Kātyāyana should prove interesting as well as useful.

YATIVṚSABHA is perhaps the most important of these early authors from a strictly historical point of view. He is known to have been the author of three important works—the *Cūrṇī-sūtras* (6,000 in number) on the *Kaṣāyapāhuḍa* of Gunadhara[1], the *Karaṇa-sūtras* (2,000 verses) containing mathematical formulae[2], and the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, an early Prākṛt text on the subject of cosmology.[3] The last named work is divided into nine major chapters and is said to contain 8,000 verses.[4] Major portion of it is in *gāthās* and the rest in prose. Although it mainly deals with the nature, shape, size, divisions and subdivisions of the universe, it also incidentally gives much information on Jaina doctrine, Purāṇic traditions about the Tīrthaṅkaras and other heroes and about ancient geography and on political history of ancient India such as the dynastic chronology, commencement of the Śakas' rule and their eras, and so on. At the same time, the work is highly valuable for a study of the development of the science of mathematics in ancient times. Several scholars have

---

[1] See *Jayadhavala*, Vol. I, introduction. Also *Varṇī Volume* (Sagar, 1949), p. 326, f.n. 1.

[2] ibid. It has been alluded to in *Tiloyapannati* itself.

[3] MS. is preserved in the C.J.O.L., Arrah. It has recently been published from Solapur, in two vols., ed. by Dr. A.N. Upadhye and Dr. Hira Lal.

[4] चूणिणसरूव अत्थ करणसरूव पमाण होदि कि (?) जंत,
अट्ठ सहस्स पमाण तिलोयपण्णत्ति णामाए।
—*Tiloyapaṇṇati*, IX. 79.

in recent times made this work a topic of hot discussion and controversy, particularly in regard to the author's date and his sequence in relation to other early gurus.

A close examination of these discussions and of the agreements and disagreements of these scholars together with a perusal of the work itself and of other pieces of evidence relevant thereto, brings out the following facts: that the original author of the *Tiloyapaṇṇati-sutta* was certainly Yativṛṣabha, that in its present form the work bears obvious traces of subsequent rehandling and must be a later recension of the original work, and that in its present form the work is not older than the 7th nor later than the 8th century A.D. How much of it corresponds to the original text and how many recensions or transformations it had undergone, if any, prior to the 8th century A.D., cannot be said with certainty.

Scholars like Premi[1], Mukhtar[2] and Upadhye[3], with slight differences on certain points, generally seem to think the present version to be the original one and to assign it and its author to the end of the 5th century A. D. Phool Chandra Shastri, however, after a comparative examination of the existing text with some other works, has shown that it must be a later compilation made probably by Jinasena (A.D. 837) on the basis of the original work.[4]

Apart from the fact that portions of this work closely resemble or seem to follow the corresponding portions in Vīrasena's *Dhavala* and that even some

---

[1] *JSI*, (Bombay, 1956), p. 64. He fixes the date at A.D. 478.

[2] *Varṇī Volume* (Sagar, 1949), p. 331. He fixes it at A.D. 483.

[3] Introduction to Solapur edition of *Tiloyapaṇṇati*.

[4] *JSB*, XI. 1, pp. 65-82.

verses from a work of Akalaṅka (7th century) seem to have been quoted or adopted in it, the mathematical portions of the work also support the later recension theory. It is highly improbable that a reputed mathematician like this author could give extremely undeveloped and rough formulae along with highly developed ones and be guilty of such flagrant inconsistency in a subject like mathematics.[1]

The internal evidence of the work itself, particularly as regards its historical portion which has not been examined by the above-mentioned scholars, corroborates this view and at the same time disproves the theory that Yativṛṣabha lived in the 5th century A.D. In Chapter IV of the work the author after stating (in v. 1474) that 3 years and 8½ months after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* the fifth cyclic era commenced, gives (in verses 1476-95) the succession of Jaina gurus after Mahāvīra up to M.E. 683, indicating side by side the verbal transmission and gradual decline of the direct canonical tradition which continued only up to the end of that period. In v. 1494 he states that after a lapse of 461 years from Mahāvīra's death here came the Śaka king, associated with the Śaka era. In the next three verses he goes on to give alternative opinions as regards this interval, the first two of these being apparently fantastic but the third coinciding with A.D. 78. In v. 1501, he again refers to the original interval of 461 years which obviously seems to be the one believed in by the original author himself. In the same context (v. 1503) he informs that the dynasty of the Śaka king who came in M.E. 461 lasted for 242 years

[1] *JSB*, XX. 2, p. 108.

(i.e., up to A.D. 176). The original information seems to have ended here.

But the work goes on to give other theories (using the word अहवा =or, another view) such as, (in v. 1504) 'then came the Guptas who ruled for 255 years followed by 42 years of Kalki, thus making up the millennium.' Next in vv. 1505-14, it gives the full dynastic list as still another theory. The list ends in M.E. 1002 (or A.D. 475).[1]

Now if the author lived in A.D. 478, 483 or 500, as most of the scholars are inclined to think, he could not have committed the blunder of stating that the Gupta dynasty ended in A.D. 431, when at that time Kumāragupta I (A.D. 414-455) was on the throne, and he was succeeded by his warrior-son Skandagupta (A.D. 455-467). The dynasty is known to have lasted till about A.D. 550. Moreover, it began in A.D. 319-20 and not in A.D. 200 or 176, as some verses of the work would make out. The total period of 231 or even 255 years for the Guptas is, however, approximately correct. The Śakas had certainly commenced their rule in M.E. 461 (or 66 B.C.) and were in existence till A.D. 176, but the Caṣṭanas are definitely known to have commenced not in 42 B.C. but about A.D. 78. At the same time the end of their 242 years exactly coincides with the beginning of the Guptas in A.D. 320. A writer of the late 5th or early 6th century might have been wrong about the names or dates belonging to the times prior to the beginning of the Christian era, but he could not have committed such obvious blunders about contemporary history.

It is, therefore, quite evident that excepting vv.

---

[1] See Appendix A (ii).

1474-96 and 1499-1503, the rest of the verses of Chap. IV mentioned above seem to be the creations of the person or persons responsible for later recensions of the work, who tried to bring it up-to-date, at least as regards the Kalki tradition. And it must have been done sufficiently long after A.D. 500. Only those first verses should be ascribed to Yativṛṣabha, and in them he gives us information only up to M.E. 683 or 703 (i.e., A.D. 156 or 176). A.D. 176 thus comes out to be the upper limit for the date of the original work and its author.

There is no doubt as regards the fact that Yativṛṣabha is held in high esteem and is considered a very ancient scholar by the writers of 7th century onwards.[1] As we have seen, his predecessors Āryamankhu and Nāgahasti are equally owned and respected in the tradition of both the sects. Āryamaṅkhu has been assigned to the first century A.D. while Nāgahasti has been proved to have belonged to *circa* A.D. 100-150. And Yativṛṣabha has been described as *antevāsī* (associate, junior colleague or immediate disciple) of Nāgahasti. It may also be noted that after Yativṛṣabha's *Cūrnis* on the *Kaṣāyapābhuḍa* several other commentaries were written on that text prior to Vīrasena's times. Hence Yativṛṣabha, one of the very last champions of the Sarasvatī movement, would seem to belong to *circa* A.D. 150-180.

---

[1] For example,

जो अज्जमखु सीसो अतेवासी विणागहत्थिस्स ।
सो वित्ति सुत्त कत्ता जइवसहो मे वरमदेउ ।।

—*Jayadhavala.*

Also see introd. to *Dhavala*, I. 1. i and *Jayadhavala*, I. Vīrasena when making use of this work generally uses such expressions as तिलोयपण्णत्ति सुत्तणुसारि......, etc.

As regards the present version of the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, it appears that the subject being a terse, uninteresting and unpopular one, the original manuscript went out of use. Sarvanandi, the author of *Lokavibhāga* (A.D. 458) or some one else soon after him mishandled it. Vīrasena (A.D. 710-90), who hunted far and wide for all the ancient texts, and because this one was very much relevant to his purpose, got hold of that very mutilated, mishandled and partially interpolated manuscript. He might have reconstructed it as best as he could for his personal use, might have tried to restore the lost portions, correct or amend the vague or ambiguous ones and here and there add his own notes too. When sometime after his death, some disciple of his or some other person saw this rare annotated MS. in Vīrasena's library, he copied it in the form of a regular MS. of Yativṛṣabha's work, incorporating all the notes etc. in its body. This was utilised by Nemicandra (A.D. 973) and after him by other writers without doubting its genuineness. And this has come down to us in the form of Yativṛṣabha's *Tiloyapaṇṇati*. Nevertheless, its value as an important source of the ancient history of India is considerable.

CHAPTER VIII

THE GREAT MASTERS

SVAMI SAMANTABHADRA is one of the greatest masters of Jaina literature. According to the editors of the old *Bombay Gazetteer*, 'Samantabhadra's appearance in South India marks an epoch not only in the annals of Digambara tradition but also in the history of Sanskrit literature.'[1] And if he has been considered as the first of the great Jainas who in some way or the other added to Kannada literature[2], he has also been regarded as one of those prominent Jaina gurus of early times who were responsible for the diffusion of Jainism in the Tamil Country.[3] It is said, "he was a brilliant disputant and a great preacher of the Jaina religion throughout India. It was the custom in those days, as alluded to by Fa-Hien (A.D. 400) and Hiuen-Tsang (A.D. 630), for a drum to be fixed in a public place in the city and any learned man, wishing to propagate a doctrine or prove his erudition and skill in debate, would strike it by way of challenge of disputation. Samantabhadra made full use of this custom and powerfully maintained the Jaina doctrine of Syādvāda."[4] He is the first writer to give a most interesting as well as authoritative exposition of the Syādvāda doctrine[5], and has also been styled as the first composer of

---

[1] *BG*, Vol. I, pt. 2, p. 406.
[2] *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, Pt. I, p. 7.
[3] *MJ*, p. 224; *SSIJ*, p. 44.
[4] E.P. Rice, *A History of Kanarese Literature*.
[5] vide., R. S. Ayengar, *SSIJ*, op. cit., p. 31; Altekar, *RTT*, p. 409.

devotional prayers (*Ādya Stutikāra*).[1] A number of later writers and epigraphic records as also the traditional accounts of this great master's life and activities fully attest to the opinions referred to above. In fact, as Muni Jinavijaya has remarked, hardly any other Ācārya has ever won such high encomium.[2] Many a later Jaina guru and author adopted his name.[3]

Unfortunately, like other early authors Samantabhadra gives but little information about himself. Whatever is known about him has been gleaned indirectly from his works, from the remarks of his commentators and admirers in later literature, from several inscriptions from the 11th to 15th century A.D., from the account of his life given in the *Kathākoṣas* and from still later works like the *Rājāvalī-kathe*. On the question of his date, too, there has been much controversy and it ranges, according to different scholars, from the 2nd to the 7th century A.D.

From an examination of the available material and a study of the life and work of this master in the background of the history of South India in the early centuries the following conclusions may be safely drawn.[4] This Samantabhadra was the first and earliest guru of that name and was styled as Svāmi.[5] He was one of the chief pontiffs of the Digambara Mūla Saṁgha,[6]

---

[1] vide., J. K. Mukhtar, *Svāmi Samantabhadra* (M.D.J.G., Bom.), pp. 16-61.

[2] vide., his article in *JSS*, I. No. 1.

[3] As many as six have so far been discovered. See *Ratnakaraṇḍa Śrāvakācāra* (M.D.J.G., Bom.), introd., pp. 5-8.

[4] For a fuller discussion see J. P. Jain's paper 'Svāmi Samantabhadra-kā-Samaya' in *Varṇī Volume* (Sagar, 1949), pp. 380-394.

[5] vide., *Svāmi Samantabhadra*, op. cit., p. 61.

[6] He has been described as श्री मूल सघ व्योम्नेन्दु by Hastimalla and Ayyapārya.

and probably associated himself with no particular branch of that Saṁgha.

He came after Balākapiccha, the successor of Umāsvāmin, and preceded Siṁhanandi after whom came Kavi Parameśvara followed by Devanandi Pūjyapāda (*c.* A.D. 464-524).[1] That Samantabhadra lived prior to Pūjyapāda is also proved by the latter's own evidence.[2]

The Simhanandi mentioned above was none other than the Jaina guru who helped in the foundation of the 'Gaṅgavāḍī 996' kingdom of the Western Gaṅgas of Mysore about A.D. 188-89.[3]

His first known commentator is Akalaṅka (*c.* A.D. 625-75) followed by Vidyānandi and others.[4]

Samantabhadra was a Tamil and not a Kannadiga as the *Rājāvalī-kathe* (A.D. 1834) would make him out to be. This work itself affirms the saint's close association with Kāñcī.[5] The *Kathākoṣas* (11th to 15th centuries) make him describe himself as काञ्च्यां नग्नाटकोऽहम् (I am the naked ascetic of Kāñcī).[6] And he has been regarded as one of the earliest gurus of the Dramila Saṁgha.[7]

---

[1] *EC*, II. 64, p. 67; ibid., 67, p. 25; also see *Kavicarite*, I, pp. 6-7; Bhandarkar's Report for 1883-4, p. 320; L. Rice's introd. to *Inscs. at Sr. Belgola*.

[2] चतुष्टय समन्तभद्रस्य —*Jainendra*, 5.4.140; for his influence on Pūjyapāda's *Sarvārthasiddhi*, see *Anekānta*, V. 10-11, p. 345.

[3] vide., K. Rao's *Gaṅgas of Talkad*; Rice, *My. & Cg.*, p. 32; Ayengar, *SSIJ*, p. 109; Saletore, *MJ*, p. 8 f.n.; *KHR*, II. 1, p. 27; *S. I. Inscs.*, II, p. 387; *EC*, Vols. II & VII; *MAR* for 1920, 21, 24, 25.

[4] On his *Āptamīmāṁsā* Akalanka wrote his *Aṣṭaśatī* and Vidyānandi his *Aṣṭasahasrī*. The latter also wrote a *Ṭīkā* on his *Yuktyānuśāsana*.

[5] vide., *Rājāvalī-kathe* by Devacandra (A.D. 1834).

[6] vide., the *Kathākoṣas* of Prabhācandra (11th century) and Nemidatta (A.D. 1518).

[7] *EC*, V, Bl. 17, p. 51 *EC*, V. Ak. 1, p. 112.;

Besides Kāñcī, he was also closely associated with the rulers of Karahāṭa (modern Karahada), the ancient and probably the first capital of the Kadambas of Banavāsī.[1]

Śivakoṭi, whom tradition uniformly makes the royal disciple of Samantabhadra and who is said to have renounced the world along with his brother Śivāyana and entered the order at the advice of the guru and to have written a commentary styled *Ratnamālā* on the *Tattvārtha* of Umāsvāmin, was probably none other than Śivaskanda Śrī, the second ruler of the Kadamba dynasty. He is known to have had Jaina leanings. Tradition says that he abdicated the throne in favour of his son Śrī Kaṇṭha who was probably the Kadamba king who is said to have intervened between Śivaskanda Śrī and Śivaskanda Varman (early part of 3rd century)[2], a predecessor of Mayūravarman Kadamba of the Chandravalli record assigned to A.D. 258.[3]

The original name of Samantabhadra was Śāntivarman who was probably a younger son of the Nāga chief who seems to be identical with Kıllikavarman Coḍa, the ruler of Uragapura (or Uraiyur—modern Trichinopoly) within the Phaṇimaṇḍala or the South

---

[1] 'प्राप्तो ह् करहाटक बहुभट विद्योत्कट सकटं।
वादार्थी विचराम्य ह् नरपति शार्दुल विक्रीडितम्।।'

These are the words he is said to have uttered in the court of the king of Karahāṭaka (probably modern Karahada, some 200 miles north of Banavāsī and situated to the south of river **Bhīmā**). That it was the earliest capital of the Kadambas is proved by their grants (vide., D. C. Sircar, *Successors of Satavahanas*, pt. II, p. 274).

[2] *EC*, VII, pp. 251-2.

[3] *EC*, VIII, Sh. 262.

Indian federation of Nāga chiefs.[1] Up to the time of the *Periplus* (A.D. 80) the Nāga kingdom of the south-eastern coast was undivided, but by the time of Ptolemy (A.D. 150) it had already been divided into two parts.[2] Moreover, by the end of the 2nd century, this Phaṇimaṇḍala or Nāgamaṇḍala was no more in existence and as a result of the foundation of the Pallava kingdom of Kāñcī that name itself had been changed into Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. Hence the birth and childhood of Samantabhadra seem to belong to sometime between A.D. 80 and 140.

Although he was admittedly a Digambara monk, Samantabhadra's greatness and antiquity was avowed even by eminent Śvetāmbara scholars like Siddhasena (7th century), Haribhadra (8th century), Hemacandra, Malayagiri and others.[3]

Among non-Jaina scholars, Dharmakīrti and Kumārila Bhaṭṭa are known to have criticised the views of Samantabhadra, for which they were counter-attacked

---

[1] 'इति फणि मडलालकारस्योरगपुराधिप सूनो. श्री स्वामि समन्त भद्र-मुने· कृतौ आप्तमीमांसायाम्।'

—found at the end of an ancient palm-leaf MS. in the collection of Dourabali Jinadāsa of Śravana Belgola; also at the end of another palm-leaf MS. preserved in the C.J.O.L., Arrah. Yet another MS. of *Aṣṭasahasrī* is said to have at its end :

'इति फणि मडलालंकारस्योरगपुराधिप सूनुना शातिवर्मनामा श्री समन्तभद्रेण।'

(cf., J. P. Faḍakule's introd. to his Sanskrit *Ṭīkā* and Marathi translation of *Svayambhu Stotra*). A ver seof Samantabhadra's *Jinastuti* also contains the name of its author as Śāntivarma. The Uragapur referred to is different from the one-mentioned by Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvaṁśa*. The latter was situated in the Pandyan country near Madura.

[2] vide., Sircar, *Successors of Satavahanas*, Pt. II, pp. 140, 146, 148. etc.; Ayengar and Srinivasachari, *Hist. India*, pp. 292-95; *BG*, I-II, pp. 318-19 f.n.

[3] vide., J. K. Mukhtar, *Svāmi Samantabhadra*, op. cit.

by Akalaṅka (7th century).[1] Even Diṅnāga (A.D. 345-425) is found to bear visible traces of Samantabhadra's influence[2], while Nāgārjuna, who is generally supposed to be a contemporary of Kaniṣka, seems to have been a senior contemporary of Samantabhadra as perhaps the former's *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* inspired the latter in writing his *Yuktyānuśāsana* and as Samantabhadra's criticism of Nāgārjuna's views is like that of a contemporary.[3]

In the works of Samantabhadra the description of Jaina ascetics as purely 'forest recluses' befits only to the times prior to about A.D. 300. Soon after, the practice of 'Caityavāsa' (residing in establishments) began to get more and more popular.[4]

The traditional date of Samantabhadra is Saka 60 (or A.D. 138)[5], and as Dr. B.A. Saletore observes, "Credence may be given to the tradition that Samantabhadra lived in the 2nd century when we examine the pontifical pedigrees as given in epigraphs from beginning of 12th to 15th century. It is not arbitrary to assume that Samantabhadra who, as related above, is always spoken of in inscriptions as having come almost soon after Balākapiccha, lived in the first quarter of the 2nd century A.D."[6]

In view of these facts, Svāmi Samantabhadra seems to have lived about A.D. 120-185.

---

1 vide., introd. to *NKC* (M.D.J.G., Bombay).

2 *Anekānta*, V. 12, p. 383.

3 ibid., VII. 1-2, p. 10; for dates of Diṅnāga and Nāgārjuna, vide., introd. to *Tattva-saṁgraha*, pp. 68 and 73.

4 vide., *Ratnakaraṇḍa-śrāvakācāra*, v. 147; *JSB*, XIII. 2, pp. 119 ff.

5 Bhandarkar's Report for 1883-84, p. 320; L. Rice, *My. & Cg.*, p. 203.

6 *MJ*, pp. 225-228.

His known and available works, all in chaste Sanskrit, are:

Āptamīmāṁsā or *Devāgama Stotra*,
Yuktyānuśāsana,
Svayambhustotra,
Jinastutiśataka or *Stutividyā*, and
Ratnakaraṇḍa Śrāvakācara.

The last is the earliest available Jaina work laying down rules of conduct for the guidance of the laity. His allusions to persons to whom tradition ascribes illustrious deeds have been developed into full stories by the commentators.

Besides the above, several other works are also ascribed to him, but as they have not so far been discovered nothing can be said about them.

PADALIPTA, who may be placed early in 3rd century A.D., is perhaps the first Śvetāmbara author and is said to have written the *Nirvāṇa Kalikā* and the *Taraṅgavatīkathā*, none of which exists today. He is said to have been a successor of Nāgahasti. Tradition associates him with the rise of the Muruṇḍas who are described as having cordial relations with the Kuṣaṇas of Puruṣapura. The flood and devastation of Pāṭaliputra, mentioned in the tradition, is said to have been corroborated by archaeological discoveries.[1]

MANADEVA is reputed to have composed a *Śāntistava* for the restoration of peace and prosperity to the city of Taxila afflicted by the cruel onslaughts of the

[1] Introduction to *Prabhāvakacarita*, Gujarati edition by Kalyanavijaya (Bhavanagar, V.E. 1987); *Premī Volume* (1946), pp. 233-40. From the history of Cambodia also we learn that in the 4th century A.D. a Muruṇḍa king of Pāṭaliputra had received an embassy from the king of Funan (vide., B. R. Chatterji, *Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia*, Calcutta, 1928, Appendix).

Turuṣkas (not Tukharians), which fact is also corroborated by archaeological discoveries.[1] He may be assigned to 3rd century A.D.

KAVI PARAMEŚVARA seems to be the most important of early *Mahāpurāṇa*-writers. His *Vāgārtha-saṁgraha*, probably in Sanskrit prose and poetry mixed, appears to have formed the basis for almost all the later writers of Jaina *Purāṇas*. Jinasena (A.D. 837), Guṇabhadra (A.D. 898), Pampa (A.D. 941), Cāvuṇḍarāya (A.D. 978), Pampa II (A.D. 1100), Nayasena (A.D. 1112), Nemicandra (A.D. 1170), Aggala (A.D. 1189), Pārśva Paṇḍita (A.D. 1205) and others have affirmed this fact. Some of them have also quoted passages from his work. He also finds mention in the Humcha inscription of A.D. 1077.[2] In literature as well as inscriptions he is invariably placed between Samantabhadra and Pūjyapāda, and would thus belong to *circa* A.D. 400.

SIDDHASENA KSAPANAKA is probably the same person who is mentioned under the name of 'Kṣapaṇaka' as one of the celebrated Nine Gems of Vikramāditya's court.[3] Traditions current in both the sects associate him with that king and with a miracle performed by that saint in the Mahākāla temple of Ujjayinī.[4]

---

[1] *Prabhāvakacarita*, op. cit.; *Premī Volume*, pp. 241-44.

[2] स पूज्य कविभिर्लोके कवीना परमेश्वर: ।
वागार्थसग्रह कृत्स्न पुराण य समगृहीत ॥
—*Ādipurāṇa* of Jinasena.

कवि परमेश्वर निगदिता गद्यकथामातृकं पुरोश्चरितं
—Colophon of *Uttarapurāṇa*.

Also see *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, I, pp. 1-7; Rice, *JRAS*, XV, pp. 295-314; *JSB*, XIII. 2, p. 85, etc.

[3] धन्वतरि: क्षपणकोऽमरसिंह शकुर्वेताल भट्टखर्पर कालिदास : . . . etc.

[4] vide., the Digambara *Paṭṭāvali* of Senagaṇa (*JSB*, I. 1, p. 38) and the Śvetāmbara *Paṭṭāvali Sāroddhāra* (*Paṭṭāvali Samuccaya*, p. 150).

Pūjyapāda[1] and after him a number of Digambara as well as Śvetāmbara writers mention his name with respect and call him a great poet. He is the first Jaina scholar of the name of Siddhasena and is probably the author of at least some of the *Dvātriṁśikās* (poems of 32 verses each) current under that author's name. In style they are said to bear the influence of Kālidāsa.[2] He may be assigned to *circa* A.D. 425.

SARVANANDI wrote his Prākṛt *Lokavibhāga* in S.E. 380 (or A.D. 458) at the village of Pāṭalika in the Pāṇarāṣṭra in the 22nd regnal year of Siṁhavarman, the lord of Kāñcī. The work is said to contain 1,563 *ślokas*. The original is, however, not available, but a Sanskrit rendering of the same by Siṁhasūri (*c.* 12th century) exists. Nevertheless, the historical value of the work is very great. It is not only the first known example of the use of the Śaka era in literature but it has also greatly helped in reconstructing the Pallava chronology by fixing the initial date of Siṁhavarman's reign.[3]

---

[1] 'वेत्तेसिद्धसेनस्य' —*Jainendra*, 5.1.7.

[2] See Introduction to *Sanmati-tarka*, Pt. Sukhlal's ed., pp. 97, 98, 170.

[3] वंश्वे स्थिते रविसुते वृषभे चजीवे, राजोत्तरेषु सितपक्षमुपेत्य चन्द्रे।
ग्रामे च पाटलिक नाम नि पाणराष्ट्रे, शास्त्र पुरालिखित वान्मुनि सर्वनंदि।
सवत्सरे तु द्वाविंशे काञ्चीश सिंहवर्मण., अशीत्यग्रेशकाब्दांनां सिद्धमेत-च्छतत्रये।

आचार्यावलिकागत विरचित तत्सिंहसूरर्षिणा।
भाषाया परिवर्तननेन निपुणैः सम्मानित साधुभिः॥

—Colophon in MS. preserved in C.J.O.L., Arrah. Also see Ayengar's *History of the Tamils*, pp. 364, 384; K. S. Ayengar, *Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture* (Cal., 1923), p 203; *Journal of Indian History*, Oxford, II, 1922, pp. 55-60; *EI*, XIV, 1917-18, pp. 331-40; *JRAS*, 1915, pp. 471-85; *MAR*, 1808-09, p. 11.

DEVARDDHIGANI KṢAMAŚRAMAṆA was the great Śvetāmbara pontiff who convened a council of all the Śvetāmbara scholars at the city of Valabhī in Gujarat. This council held in M.E. 980 (or A.D. 453) was the third great Jaina conference of the Śvetāmbara tradition, and it was at this council that the redaction of the entire canonical knowledge that had been preserved by the Śvetāmbara section was finally undertaken.[1] As we have seen, the original canon is said to have had generally suffered severe losses during the thousand years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. There were differences of opinion about the readings of the texts and some of them had several different versions each. The council of Valabhī attempted to reconcile the different readings and versions, but did not meet with much success. It seems Devarddhigaṇi acted simply as an editor and he reduced to writing the scriptures which had come down to him by word of mouth.[2] This long delayed and urgently felt redaction of the traditional knowledge preserved by the only other important section of the Jaina community opened a new era in the cultural progress of the country. It gave an unprecedented impetus to the creation of a voluminous exegetical

---

[1] 'श्री देवर्द्धिगणिक्षमाश्रमणेन श्रीवीराद् अशीत्यधिकनवशत (९८०) वर्षे जातेन, द्वादशवर्षीय दुर्भिक्षवशान बहुतर साधुव्यापत्तौ, बहुश्रुत विच्छित्तौ च जाताया .. ..भव्यलोकोपकाराय, श्रुतभक्त्यै, च श्री सघाग्रहात, मृतावशिष्ट तदाकालीन सर्वसाधून वल्लभ्यामाकार्य तन्मुखाद् विच्छिन्नावशिष्टान न्यूनाधिकान् त्रुटिताऽत्रुटितान् आगमालापकान्, अनुक्रमेण स्वमत्या सकलस्य पुस्तकारूढा. कृता:, ततो मूलतो गणधरभाषितानामपि तत्संकलनान्तरे सर्वेषामपि आगमानो कर्त्ता श्री देवर्द्धिगणि क्षमा श्रमण एव जात ।'

—*Samācāriśataka* of Samaya Sundara. Another tradition gives this date as M.E. 993 (or A.D. 466), vide., *Anekānta*, III. 12, pp. 681-82.

[2] vide., J. C. Jain, 'Jaina Canons, etc.', *JA*, XI. 2 and XII. 1.

literature in the form of *Niryuktis*, *Cūrṇis*, *Bhāṣyas*, *Vṛttis* and *Ṭīkās*, which is very valuable for the study of ancient historical traditions and cultural conditions. But although traditions preserved in the canonical texts as redacted by Devarddhigaṇi are pretty old and are parts of the texts themselves, and appear to reach as far back as the Mauryan times, there are references in them which go to show that the present canon is not the original one and that it must have undergone considerable modifications, corruptions, substitutions and interpolations, not only prior to the times of Devarddhigaṇi but even after him. Certain texts, in whole or in parts, have become totally obsolete and cannot now be restored.[1] Still, in spite of losses and corruptions the surviving texts of this branch of the Jaina canon as redacted by Devarddhigaṇi in A.D. 453 are neither without interest nor of less value for the historian of ancient India.

The texts said to have been thus redacted are the

eleven *Angas*,
twelve *Upāṅgas* or secondary limbs,
ten *Paīnnas* or scattered pieces,
six *Chedasūtras*,
two individual texts, and
four *Mūlasūtras*.

All these works, 45 in all, are in the Ardhamāgadhī or the Jaina form of Prākṛt.[2]

PUJYAPADA DEVANANDI is after Samantabhadra the greatest of the early masters of Jaina literature. A prominent religious head, a great yogi, a sublime mystic

[1] ibid.

[2] For a detailed account of these *Āgamas*, see Weber's *Sacred Literature of the Jainas* (*IA*, XVIII-XXI); H. R. Kapadia's *The Canonical Literature of the Jainas*; Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, Pt. II; *SBE*, Vol. XII, introd.

and a brilliant poet, Devanandi was also a reputed scholar, an eminent author and a master of several branches of learning. He wrote his works in Sanskrit, both prose and verse, of a high quality. His real name was Devanandi but he is generally known by his title 'Pūjyapāda.' In later times there came to be a number of other Pūjyapādas but this Devanandi Pūjyapāda is the first and most celebrated Jaina guru to bear that name.[1]

He was in his times the chief pontiff of the Nandi or Deśīyagaṇa, a branch of the Mūla Saṁgha of Kundakunda's line. According to the *Paṭṭāvalis* of that Saṁgha he was the tenth guru, the name of his predecessor being Yaśonandi and that of his successor, Jayanandi.[2] The *Rājāvalī-kathe* of Devacandra (A.D. 1834) and the Kannada *Pūjyapāda-carite* of Padmarāja and Candayya (*c.* A.D. 1800) agree in making him out a Kannadiga born in a Brahmin family, the name of his father being Mādhava Bhaṭṭa and that of his mother, Śrīdevī.[3] Many miraculous powers and marvellous feats are attributed to this saint-scholar and he has been held in high esteem by posterity.

Pūjyapāda was probably the first Jaina guru to devote himself to the writing of valuable secular works besides religious ones. That he was a great grammarian nobody seems to have had any doubts about[4] and the same may be said about his being a master of the science of medicine.[5] Hence little wonder if he was patronised

---

[1] J. P. Jain, 'Jaina Gurus of the Name of Pūjyapāda,' *JA*, XVI. 1-2; XVIII. 1.

[2] *JSB*, I. 4, p. 78.

[3] vide., R. Narsimhachar, *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, Pt. II.

[4] vide., R. Narsimhachar, *Karṇāṭaka Śabdānuśāsana*; Belvalkar, *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar* (Poona, 1915), pp. 62-68; Kielhorn, *IA*, X. 1881, pp. 75-79. Also see J. P. Jain, op. cit.

[5] J. P. Jain, op. cit.; *EC*, II, 258; VIII, Nr. 46.

by kings and nobles. In fact, there is ample evidence to prove that he was the religious preceptor, and probably a secular teacher also, of the great Gaṅga monarch Durvinīta Koṅgiṇi of Talkad.[1]

The date of Durvinīta Gaṅga, however, has lately been a matter of controversy. There are generally three sets of opinion on this question.

Scholars like Lewis Rice, E.P. Rice, and Bühler placed Durvinīta as also Pūjyapāda in the latter half of the 5th century A.D. and had no doubt as to their *guru-śiṣya* relationship.[2]

Those like R. Narsimhachar, who formerly supported the above theory, later on, on the basis of the alleged newly found evidence of the *Avantisundarī Kathāsāra*, shifted the date of Durvinīta by some 125 years forward, but seeing no reason to shift the date of Pūjyapāda they declared that the two had nothing to do with each other.[3] Some other exponents of this later-date-theory have tried to seek support from the inter-dynastic relations between the Gaṅgas and the Cālukyas, Kadambas, Pallavas, Punnāṭas, etc., in Durvinīta's time. They have ignored his association with Pūjyapāda.[4]

Some still other advocates of the later-date-theory, misled by the allusions to one Pūjyapāda in several

---

[1] cf., *JA*, XVIII. 1, pp. 13-15.

[2] ibid., also see *Coorg Inscriptions*, introd., p. 3; *My. & Cg.*, I, p. 373; *Karṇāṭaka Bhāṣābhūṣaṇaṁ*, introd., p. 12; E.P. Rice, *A History of Kanarese Literature*, p. 25; *IA*, XV, p. 355.

[3] *MAR*, 1924, p. 70; 1928, p. 28; also his Presidential Address at the 8th session of the A.I.O.C. His new date for Durvinita is A.D. 605-660. For his earlier view see *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, pp. 5-6.

[4] *Proceedings*, 12th session of A.I.O.C., Vol. II, pp. 534-41; Moraes, *Kadamba-kula*, pp. 55-56; *Triveṇī*, I, pp. 112-20; J. Dubreuil, *Ancient History of the Deccan*, p. 107.

Cālukyan records of the 7th and 8th century A.D., found ground for shifting forward the date of Pūjyapāda also by about the same number of years and thus claimed to find fresh support for the new date of Durvinīta who, they see no reason to disbelieve, was the royal disciple of Pūjyapāda.[1]

A close examination of the different views mentioned above and of the available evidence on the subject, it may, however, be concluded that Durvinīta must have ruled from about A.D. 482 to 522 and that he cannot be placed in the 7th century A.D. as suggested by the exponents of the later-date-theory.[2] He was the son and successor of Avinīta Kongiṇi (A.D. 430-82) and a grandson of Tadaṅgala Mādhava or Mādhavavarman III (*c.* A.D. 400) of the Western Gaṅga dynasty of Talkad. He was succeeded by Muṣkara (about A.D. 523) who was the grandfather of Bhūvikrama (*c.* A.D. 609-70). Durvinīta was father-in-law of Cālukya Vijayāditya whose son Jayasiṁha Vallabha Viṣṇuvardhana[3] was the founder of the Western Cālukya dynasty of Vātāpī and the grandfather of Pulakesin I. Durvinīta killed in battle Kaduvetti Trilocana (Caṇḍadaṇḍa or Nandivarman Pallava), the grandfather of Siṁhaviṣṇu (*c.* A.D. 550-600). Durvinīta's grandmother was a daughter of Kākutsthavarma Kadamba (*c.* A.D. 399) and a sister of Kṛṣṇavarma I (*c.* A.D. 450). His father-in-law was Skanda Punnāṭa, the son of Bhujaga Punnāṭa whose father-in-law was Gaṅga Mādhava Siṁhavarman of

---

[1] Sircar, *Successors of Satavahanas*, p. 300, K. B. Pathak, 'Pūjyapāda and the Authorship of *Jainendra*', *IA*, XII, pp. 19-21.

[2] J. P. Jain, 'The Date of Durvinīta Gaṅga,' *JA*, XVIII, 2, pp. 1-11.

[3] cf., S. Srikantha Sastri, *Sources of Karnataka History*, Vol. I (Mysore, 1940), introd., p. x.

the Perur line (4th century). Durvinīta got Punnāṭa as dowry of his wife.

As regards the evidence of the *Avantīsundarīkathā* and its *Sāra*[1], it has already been refuted by Prof. Keith.[2] At least there is nothing in it which makes it possible to identify the Rājaputra Viṣṇuvardhana, who is said to have been a friend of poet Bhāravi in their boyhood, with Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana, the Eastern Cālukya king of Veṅgi. He rather seems to have been identical with Jayasiṁha Viṣṇuvardhana, the Cālukya king of Badāmi. Ravikīrtti in the Aihole inscription simply compares himself with Kālidāsa and Bhāravi[3] but it does not imply that they were his contemporaries. Bhāravi's name is generally mentioned soon after Kālidāsa. The above-mentioned *Kathā* states that the poet met Durvinīta in his wanderings and that the latter wrote a commentary on a portion of the poet's *Kirātārjunīya*. Bhāravi must then have been nearing middle age. He is also said to have passed his last days at the court of Siṁhaviṣṇu Pallava (*c.* A.D. 550-600). Moreover, Bhāravi was, according to the same *Kathāsāra*, the great-grandfather of poet Daṇḍin who seems to have been a senior contemporary of Bāna (*c.* A.D. 608-648). Thus Bhāravi could not have lived much beyond (A.D. 465-555).

---

[1] Discovered in two moth-eaten, damaged and quite old MSS. of these works, by the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library. The *Kathā* purports to have been written by Dandin and the *Sāra* by some unknown author. It is the latter which in its first chapter contains an account of Bhāravi and Dandin.

[2] Keith, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Preface, pp. xvi ff. He also refers to *EC*, III, 107.

[3] 'सजयति कवि रविकीर्त्तिः कविताश्रित कालिदास भारविकीर्ति'

—Aihole Inscription of S.E. 556 (*EI*, VI, No. 1).

The dates of Bhāravi (A.D. 465-555) and Durvinīta (A.D. 482-522), and incidentally of Pūjyapāda, curiously confirm each other and they need not be brought forward. There is no doubt that Durvinīta, like most other rulers of his dynasty, was an ardent Jaina[1] and there is evidence to prove that he was the royal patron and probably a devotee and a pupil of Pūjyapāda. In fact, the latter appears to have been the head of a great centre of learning, probably the first of its kind, at or near Talkad, the capital of the Western Gaṅgas in south Karnataka.

There have also been differences of opinion as regards the date of this Pūjyapāda. But besides the above-mentioned facts there are quite a number of other facts which help us to fix his date independently within closely approximate limits.

Jaina tradition, both literary as well as inscriptional, invariably and unmistakably places Pūjyapāda in between Samantabhadra (*c.* A.D. 120-185) and Akalaṅka (*c.* A.D. 625-675). Pūjyapāda himself refers to Samantabhadra in his *Jainendra* and his works like the *Sarvārthasiddhi* bear visible traces of Samantabhadra's influence. On the other hand, Akalaṅka quotes from and refers to Pūjyapāda and his *Jainendra* for which he shows great respect and makes full use of his *Sarvārthasiddhi* in his own *Tattvārtharājavārttika*.[2]

There must have been considerable intervals both between Samantabhadra and Pūjyapāda as also between Pūjyapāda and Akalaṅka since several gurus and scholars are known to have intervened in each case.

---

[1] *JA*, XVIII. 1, pp. 13-15; Saletore, *MJ*, p. 19; Rice, *My. & Cg.*

[2] *NKC*, Pt. I & II, introductions (Bombay).

In the *Jainendra* we find mention of a number of previous scholars such as Bhūtabali, Yaśobhadra, Prabhācandra, Siddhasena, Śrīdatta and Samantabhadra, all of whom are real historical persons but none of whom is known to have lived after A.D. 450.

Among non-Jaina scholars he has been found to have referred to certain verses of the Buddhist scholar Diṅnāga (A.D. 345-425)[1] and to Iśvarakṛṣṇa Vārṣagaṇya, the author of *Sāṁkhyakārikā* (V.E. 507=A.D. 450).[2]

The first mention of the Vṛhaspati Saṁvatsara is found in the *Jainendra* and this very era appears in the Gupta and Kadamba grants dating from Śaka 379 to 450 (A.D. 457 to 528).[3]

Thus, although the *Paṭṭāvalis* give Pūjyapāda Devanandi's date as V.E. 258-308 (or A.D. 201-251)[4], the upper limit of his date cannot be taken back prior to A.D. 450. In order to fix the lower limit of his date, he is known to have definitely preceded Akalaṅka (*c.* A.D. 625-675) and Vāmana and Jayāditya (died in A.D. 660) in their *Kāśikāvṛtti* refer to the *Jainendra*.[5] Siddhasena Divākara, who is known to have preceded Akalanka, alludes to Pūjyapāda in his *Sanmati*.[6] Similarly, Bhadrabāhu Niryuktikāra (*c.* A.D. 550) appears to have lived after him.[7] Guṇanandi who was a grand-disciple of Pūjyapāda and was probably the author of the original *Jainendra-prakriyā* lived before Akalaṅka.[8] Lastly, according to Devasena's *Darśanasāra* (A.D. 933),

---

[1] *Anekānta*, IV. 12, p. 383, *Tattvasaṁgraha*, introd., p. 73.
[2] K. B. Pathak, *IA*, XII, pp. 19-21 (Bombay, 1883).
[3] ibid.
[4] *JSB*, I. 4, pp. 78, 58.
[5] K. B. Pathak, op. cit.
[6] *PJVS*, introd., pp. 150-153.
[7] *Anekānta*, IX. 11, p. 449.
[8] *MAR*, 1923, p. 15; *MJ*, p. 231.

Pūjyapāda's disciple Vajranandi founded the Draviḍa Saṁgha in Madura in V.E. 526 (or A.D. 469).[1] But the *Paṭṭāvalis* give an interval of 58 years between Pūjyapāda and Vajranandi and place two other gurus in between them; they assign 50 years to Pūjyapāda and 22 to Vajranandi. This would take back Pūjyapāda to the latter half of the 4th century A.D. But it appears that Devasena is mistaken. The Draviḍa Saṁgha was certainly organised and established in the Pāṇḍyan country, and most probably by Vajranandi and his colleagues. The figure of the date, i.e., 526, also seems to be approximately correct. But the era stated by Devasena as being the Vikrama Samvat appears to be wrong. It seems to have been the Śaka era which would give this date as S.E. 526 (or A.D. 604). In fact, the era generally used in the South was the Śaka era, but Devasena himself being a northerner and used to the Vikrama era mentioned that era with all the dates he gave. He seems to have forgotten to convert the years of the Śaka era into those of the Vikrama era. The assumption is confirmed by a verification of some other dates given by the same writer.[2] Hence taking A.D. 604 as the date of the foundation of the Draviḍa

[1] 'सिरि पुज्जपादसीसो दाविड सघस्स कारगोदुट्ठो।
णामेण वज्जणदी पाहुडवेदी महासत्तो॥
पचसए छब्बीसे विक्कमरायस्स मरणपत्तस्स।
दक्खिण महुराजादो दाविडसंघो महामोहो॥'

—*Darśanasāra*, p. 24 (cf., *JBBRAS*, XVII, p. 74; Hiralal, *Cat. Mss.*, p. 562).

[2] For example, the date of Kumārasena, the founder of the Kāṣṭhāsaṁgha, who was a disciple of Vinayasena, the disciple of Jinasena (*c.* A.D. 850). He must have lived towards the end of the 9th century or beginning of the 10th, but Devasena's date for him (V.E. 793) places him in the early part of the 8th century. If it is taken to be in the Śaka era, it would fit in with the time of Kumārasena.

Saṁgha by Vajranandi and allowing for the 22 years of his pontificate in the Nandī Saṁgha, the lower limit of Pūjyapāda's date comes to A.D. 524.

Keeping in view Pūjyapāda's contemporaneity with Durvinīta Gaṅga whose father Avinīta Koṅgiṇi is said to have himself appointed this scholarly monk as teacher of his son even before the latter's accession to the throne[1] and Pūjyapāda's 50-year pontificate indicating a long life, his date may safely be fixed as *circa* A.D. 464-524, allowing for a moderate 10-year period of monkhood before his accession to the pontifical seat. The value of Pūjyapāda's date in fixing the dates of a number of Jaina and non-Jaina scholars and in reconstructing the chronology of the Gaṅgas, incidentally also of the Cālukyas, Kadambas, Pallavas, Punnāṭas, etc., is obvious.

The known works of this great master are :—

Jainendra Vyākaraṇa—a complete and authoritative work on Sanskrit grammar, classed among the first eight masterly treatises on the subject[2];

Sarvārthasiddhi—the earliest available, authentic and learned commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* of Umāsvāmin;

Daśabhaktyādisaṁgraha—preserves valuable traditions, particularly about the life of Mahāvīra;

Samādhitantra;

Iṣṭopadeśa and

Śāntyāṣṭaka.

---

[1] cf., L. Rice, *My. & Cg.*, introd.

[2] इन्द्रश्चन्द्रः काशकृत्सन पिशली शाकटायना : ।
पाणिन्यमर जैनेन्द्रा जयन्त्यष्टौचशाब्दिका : ॥

—Vopadeva's *Dhātupāṭha.*

Also see Belvalkar, *Jinaratnakoṣa* (Poona), p. 146; *IA*, X, pp. 75-79.

Besides these Pūjyapāda is also known to have written the following which, however, have not yet been discovered :—

Śabdāvatāra Nyāsa on the *Sūtras* of Pāṇini;
A *Vaidyaśāstra*, probably of the name of *Kalyāṇa-kāraka* and dealing chiefly with *Śālākya-tantra*;
Jainābhiṣeka and
Chandaśāstra.

CHAPTER IX

THE AGE OF THE LOGICIANS

THE key-note of Jaina literature in the several centuries after Pūjyapāda was logic. Akalaṅka, the virtual founder of the mediaeval school of Jaina logic, dominated this age. Side by side with the logicians a number of important writers of other subjects also flourished.

BHADRABAHU III, the author of the *Niryuktis*, ten in number, was the first commentator of the Śvetāmbara *Sūtras* as also perhaps the earliest author of this age. The *Niryuktis* being a sort of explanatory notes on the *Sūtra*-texts contain much useful material by way of traditions, historical and semi-historical.[1] Traditional belief made the author of the *Niryuktis*, identical with Bhadrabāhu I (4th century B.C.), but it was a mistake. In fact, he was the third Jaina guru of that name, belonged to the Śvetāmbara sect and lived in the 6th century A.D.[2] He is said to have been a brother of the famous astronomer Varāhamihira (said to have died in A.D. 587), the date of whose *Pañcasiddhāntikā* is S.E. 427 (or A.D. 505).[3] As the *Niryuktis* mention many a person and event belonging to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries and as the redaction of the *Sūtras* themselves had been

---

[1] See *JA*, XII. 1, pp. 11-12; *IHQ*, XI, p. 631, XII, pp. 270 ff.; Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, Pt. II, p. 483, etc.

[2] *Anekānta*, IX. 11, pp. 443-44; *PJVS*, p. 146.

[3] 'तत्थ य....भद्दबाहु नाम माहणो हुत्था, तस्स य परमपिम्म सरिसीवहु मिहरो वराहमिहरो नाम सहोयरो ।' —*Samyaktva Saptatikā Vṛtti.* Merutuṅga in *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi*, ch. v, also says the same thing. For Varāhamihira's date, see A. Macdonell, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 564; Smith, *Oxford History of India* (1920), p. 160.

accomplished in the latter half of the 5th century, this Bhadrabāhu III and his *Niryuktis* may be assigned to *circa* A.D. 525-50.

SIDDHAŚENA DIVAKARA was the author of the famous philosophical treatise, the *Sanmati-sūtra*, also known as *Sanmati-tarka* or *Sanmati-prakaraṇa*.[1] The author and his work are claimed and held in esteem equally by both the sects. Like a number of other Jaina gurus there have been several Siddhasenas, which has given rise to confusion. There are scholars who attribute all the known works current under the name of Siddhasena to one and the same guru of that name[2], but it is not correct.[3] The present Siddhasena, surnamed 'Divākara', is the second guru of that name and is one of the greatest Jaina philosophers and logicians. In his work we find for the first time a comparative study of the different Brahmanical and Buddhist systems of philosophy and their criticism from the Jaina point of view. A number of commentaries were written on this work between the 6th and the 17th century.[4] The author himself gives us practically no information about himself but the following facts help us to fix his time and identity.

Jinasena in his *Jayadhavala* (A.D. 837), Vīrasena in his *Dhavala* (A.D. 780) and Haribhadra in his several works (*c.* A.D. 775) refer to him by name and quote

[1] Text was published from Bhavanagar (1908), and there is a well-edited publication with Gujarati translation and introduction in English by Pt. Sukhlal and Bechardas (tr. by Messrs Athawale and Gopani), Bombay, 1939.

[2] Sukhlal's Introduction, op. cit., and his articles in *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, Vol. III.

[3] *Anekānta*, IX. 11, pp. 17-66; *PJVS*, Introduction, pp. 119 ff.

[4] ibid. and Sukhlal's Introduction to *Sanmati*, op. cit.

from his work. Abhayadeva (11th century) is the earliest available commentator of *Sanmati*, but before him Sumatideva and Mallavādī are also known to have written *Ṭīkās* on this work. In some *Cūrṇis* written by Jinadāsa Mahattara (A.D. 676), the *Sanmati* has been praised as a *prabhāvaka śāstra* and his views are alluded to even by Jinabhadra (A.D. 609).[1] Hence *circa* A.D. 600 would be the lower limit of Siddhasena's date.

Siddhasena in his work criticises the Buddhist philosophers Nāgārjuna, Maitreya, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Diṅnāga and Śaṅkara Svāmi, all of whom belong prior to the 6th century A.D. He appears to be acquainted with the works and views of Pūjyapāda (A.D. 464-524) as well as of Bhadrabāhu III (A.D. 525-50).[2] Siddhasena Divākara, the author of *Sanmati*, therefore, seems to have lived in *c.* A.D. 550-600.

A number of authors from the 8th century onwards bestow high praise on Siddhasena and his work.[3] Among them is Jinasena, the author of *Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783), who in his own genealogy also mentions one Siddhasena as being 9th in ascent from himself.[4] Taking an average of 25 years for each generation, which is also otherwise evident from the genealogy itself, this Siddhasena of the *Harivaṁśa* would belong to *c.* A.D. 583. Siddhasena has often been mentioned simply as Divākara. Some Śvetāmbara *Paṭṭāvalis* give his

---

[1] ibid.

[2] ibid.

[3] ibid.

[4] See *Harivaṁśa*, ch. 66, v. 29. In ch. 1, v. 30; also he is praised—

जगत्प्रसिद्ध बोधस्य वृषभस्येव निस्तुषाः ।
बोधयन्ति सतां बुद्धि सिद्धसेनस्य सूक्तयः ॥

predecessor's name as Indradinna.[1] Ravişeṇa in his *Padmacarita* (A.D. 676) informs us that his great-grand preceptor was one Divākara Yati, the disciple of Indra guru.[2] This Divākara Yati would also belong to the last quarter of the 6th century.

MALLAVADI, the Śvetāmbara author of *Dvāda-śāra-naya-cakra*, a work on logic, and perhaps of a *Ṭīkā* on Siddhasena's *Sanmati*, also belongs to *c.* A.D. 600.[3] He refers to even Bhartṛhari (A.D. 590-650).

SANGHADASAGANI, the author of *Vasudevahiṇḍi*[4], the first available Jaina version of the *Mahābhārata* (though the work was completed later by other writers) and of the *Bṛhat-kalpa-bhāṣya*, a very early commentary of the *Kalpasūtra*, also belongs to the latter part of the 6th century A.D. His works contain many Jaina traditions relating to ancient times.

THE LEADERS OF THE DRAMILA OR DRAVIDA SAMGHA—The history of the religious and cultural activity of the Jainas in the Tamil countries dates from the times of Bhadrabāhu I (4th century B.C.).[5] We have seen that Kundakunda (8 B.C.—A.D. 44) and after him Samantabhadra (A.D. 120-185) pioneered the Jaina movement in those lands. But from Pūjyapāda's times (A.D. 464-524) the movement began to gather unprecedented momentum. In the latter half of the 6th and early

---

[1] *Paṭṭāvali Samuccaya*, p. 150.

[2] See *Padmacarita*, Parva 123, v. 167.

[3] See *Sanmati-tarka* (Sukhlal's edition), Introduction, op. cit., pp. 71-72. The *Prabhāvakacarita* (14th century), however, places him in M.E. 884 (or A.D. 327), which is evidently wrong.

[4] cf., Dr Alsdorf, *Harivaṁśa-purāṇa* (Hamburg, 1936), pp. 94-109. The text with Gujarati translation by Prof. Sandesaria has been published from Bhavanagar in 1946.

[5] See Rice, *My. & Cg.*, pp. 2-10; Narsimhachar, *Inscriptions at Śravaṇa Belgola*, pp. 36-40; Smith, *Oxford History of India*, pp. 75-76, etc.

part of the 7th century a number of eminent Jaina ascetic scholars contributed to make Tamil Jainism reach its zenith. As has been seen, Vajranandi or Vajrasūri, a successor of Pūjyapāda, in the year 526 (probably A.D. 604), founded the Dramila Saṁgha as a regular institution and made Madura its headquarters.[1] He himself was a great scholar and the author of *Nava-stotra*, 'an elegant work embodying the variety of the teachings of all the Arhats.'[2] It may be mentioned here that it is to the credit of the Dramila Jainas that most of the best works of Tamil classical literature of the Saṅgamas were produced. These works, apart from their literary merit and religious or philosophical importance, are quite valuable for social and cultural history of those lands in ancient times. Jaina writers also enriched Tamil literature by writing valuable works on secular subjects like grammar, lexicon, prosody, mathematics, astronomy, etc.[3]

Of the other more important leaders of the Dramila Saṁgha mention may be made of Guṇanandi (*c.* A.D. 550), a disciple of Pūjyapāda and the author of the original *Prakriyā* on the *Jainendra*; Vakragrīva (*c.* A.D. 575), author of *Nava-śabda-vācya* and mentioned in inscriptions just before Vajranandi; Sumatideva (*c.* A.D. 600), author of perhaps the first commentary on the *Sanmati*; and Pātrakesari who wrote his *Trilakṣaṇa-kadarthana* in refutation of the *Trilakṣaṇa* theory of the

[1] *Darśanasāra*, p. 24; R. S. Ayengar, *SSIJ*, p. 52; *History of the Tamils*, p. 247.

[2] *My. & Cg.*, p. 196; *EC*, II. 67, pp. 25-26. For other inscriptions associating him with the Draviḍa Saṁgha, see *EC*, V, Bl. 17, p. 51; *EC*, VI, Kd. 69, p. 13; *EC*, V, Ak. 1, p. 112; etc.

[3] See Chakravarti, *Jaina Literature in Tamil* (Arrah); *SSIJ*, op. cit., pp. 76-77, 81-104; Ramchandra Dikshitar, *Studies in Tamil Literature*.

Buddhist logician Diṅnāga (A.D. 345-425).[1] Akalaṅka refers to and quotes from him. Besides the Jaina scholars like Anantavīrya, Vidyānandi and Vādirāja, the Buddhist logician Śāntarakṣita (A.D. 705-62) in his *Tattvasaṅgraha* and his disciple Kamalaśīla (A.D. 713-63) in his *Pañjikā* of that work refer to Pātrakesari and his views.[2] Jinasena in the *Ādipurāṇa* (*c.* A.D. 850) praises him along with Akalaṅka[3], Ugrādiya in his *Kalyāṇakāraka* (*c.* A.D. 800) describes him as an efficient surgeon[4], and his influence is visible in the *Nyāyāvatāra* of Siddhasena III (*c.* A.D. 700).[5] An inscription of A.D. 1128 mentions him just after Vajranandi and tells that by the grace of Padmāvatī he had refuted the *Trilakṣaṇa* theory.[6] The inscription of A.D. 1137, however, places Vajranandi after Pātrakesari and describes the latter as the head of the Dramila Saṁgha.[7] He would thus belong to *c.* A.D. 575-625.

SRIVARDHADEVA, the author of *Cūḍāmaṇi*, is another celebrated name.[8] That he was a great poet is evident from the praise bestowed upon him by poet Daṇḍin as mentioned in an inscription of A.D. 1128[9]

---

[1] See *NKC*, Pt. I, Introduction.

[2] ibid., also *Anekānta*, I. 2, pp. 73 ff.; *PJVS*, p. 142.

[3] भट्टाकलंक श्रीपाल पात्रकेसरिण गुणा, etc. —*Ādipurāṇa*, I.53.

[4] शालाक्य पूज्यपाद प्रकटितमधिक शल्य तन्त्र च पात्रस्वामिप्रोक्त . . .,etc. —*Kalyāṇakāraka*.

[5] *PJVS*, op. cit., p. 141.

[6] *EC*, II. 67, pp. 25-26.

[7] श्रीमद द्रमिल सघाग्रेसरर—*EC*, V, Bl. 17, p. 51.

[8] Rice, *My. & Cg.*, (London, 1909), p. 198.

[9] चूडामणि: कवीना चुडामणिनाम सेव्य काव्यकवि : ।
श्रीवर्द्धदेव एवहि कृतपुण्य: कीर्तिमाहर्त्तुं ॥
य एव मुपश्लोकितो दण्डिना—
जन्होः कन्यां जटाग्रेण बमार परमेश्वर: ।
श्रीवर्द्धदेव संधत्से जिव्हाग्रेण सरस्वतीं ॥ —cf., *EC*, II. 67, p. 260.
Also see *JDL*, IX, pt. 2, 1923, pp. 97 ff.

which giving some details about him mentions him along with Cintāmaṇi, the author of the work of the same name, and after Pātrakesari but before Akalaṅka. Some scholars have identified him with Tumbalūrācārya, the author of a commentary also named *Cūḍāmaṇi* on the Digambara *Āgamas*.[1] It is curious to note that the work *Cūḍāmaṇi* and its author Śrīvardhadeva are equally claimed by the Tamil people[2], the Kannada people, the canonical writers and the Sanskrit poets. It is quite likely that there has been some confusion somewhere due to identical names, or this author must have been a great linguist and a versatile genius. His association with the Dramila Saṁgha and his contemporaneity with Pātrakesari, Akalaṅka and poet Daṇḍin fix his time about the first quarter of the 7th century A.D.

Besides these leaders of the Dramila Saṁgha there were several other Jaina authors belonging to the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

MANATUNGA is the author of the celebrated *Bhaktāmara* or *Ādinātha-stotra*.[3] A tradition associates him with king Śrī Harṣa (A.D. 606-47).[4] The *Paṭṭāvalis* make him precede some Vīra[5], and a Vīradeva Kṣapaṇaka is mentioned by Harṣa's court poet Bāṇa as his own comrade.[6] Mānatuṅga and his *Stotra* are equally

---

[1] *Kavicarite*, Pt. I, p. 8, f.n. 1; Rice, *A History of Kanarese Literature*, p. 24; *Inscriptions at Sr. Belgola*, p. 44.

[2] *SSIJ*, pp. 94, 103; Rangacharya, *Topographical List*, I, p. 80.

[3] See Jacobi's Foreword to *Bhaktāmara*, etc., ed. H.R. Kapadia, also Max Müller's *India, What can it teach us?* (London, 1883), p. 291.

[4] Jacobi's Foreword, op. cit.

[5] vide., *Paṭṭāvalis* of Tapāgaccha and Khartaragaccha (*Paṭṭāvali Samuccaya*).

[6] See Dr. Peterson's Introduction to *Kādambarī*, pp. 52-53; also introd. to *Kādambarī* (Alld., 1931), p. 3, f.n.

claimed and respected by both the sects. He would thus belong to the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

JINABHADRA KSAMASRAMANA is one of the earliest commentators of the Svetāmbara *Āgama-sūtras* and is generally known as the Bhāṣyakāra. His well-known works are the *Viśesāvaśyaka-bhāṣya* and *Viśeṣaṇavatī*. Hemacandra calls him a great commentator.[1] He also finds mention in the *Kathāvalī* of Bhadreśvara and in several mediaeval *Prabandhas* which give the date of his death as V.E. 645 (or A.D. 588).[2] But the author himself in the colophon found at the end of a very old manuscript of his *Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya*, discovered by Muni Jinavijaya in the Jaiselmera Bhandara, informs that he completed that work in S.E. 531 (or A.D. 609) in the city of Valabhī, in the reign of King Śilāditya.[3] Harṣa was also known as Śilāditya and is also known to have conquered Valabhī. But the Śilāditya alluded to here seems to have been a king of the Maitraka dynasty and probably Śilāditya I alias Dharmāditya I, the successor of Dharasena II (G.E. 270) and the predecessor of Dhruvasena II Bālāditya (G.E. 310). His dated records range between G.E. 286 and 290 (A.D. 605-11).[4] This Śilāditya of Valabhī was, according to the *Ārya-mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa*, the ruler of the country that stretched beyond Ujjayinī up to the land of the Lāṭas on the sea-coast.[5] As Jinabhadra criticises Siddhasena Divākara (*c.* A.D. 550-600) and mentions poet Subandhu and his *Vāsavadattā* (6th century)[6], the date A.D. 609

[1] vide., *Siddha-hema*, II. 2. 39.

[2] *Sanmati-tarka* (Sukhlal's ed.), Introduction, p. 73.

[3] See *PJVS*, introd., p. 145; Upadhye's English introd. to the same, pp. 1-2.

[4] *IA*, XV, p. 273.

[5] *PIHC*, (Nagpur, 1950), pp. 62-63.

[6] *Sanmati*, Introduction, op. cit., pp. 74-82. Poet Bāṇa also mentions Subandhu.

for Jinabhadra and his *Bhāṣya* seems to be quite correct.

RAVIKIRTTI, the celebrated composer and donee of the famous Aihole Inscription dated S.E. 556 (or A.D. 634) of Pulakeśin II[1], was a great Jaina poet and scholar of Maharashtra. Ravikīrtti's temple at Aihole[2] seems to have been a great centre of learning in those times. He was lucky in having the great Pulakeśin as his patron.

AKALANKA THE GREAT, whose full name was Bhaṭṭa-Akalaṅkadeva, was the first guru of that name.[3] He has also been alluded to as Pūjyapāda, Deva, Devendra, Munīndra, etc.[4] He was the greatest Jaina logician and dialectician and was the virtual founder of the Jaina school of Indian logic. In fact, Akalaṅka-nyāya became a byword with the logicians of different sects.[5] His own commentators were some of the most eminent logicians and he had a host of admirers amongst the scholars of both the sects as well as among non-Jainas. Numerous inscriptions and literary references, traditions and popular legends speak eloquently of the homage paid by posterity to this great master.[6]

His definitely known and available works are:

Tattvārtha-Rājavārttika—a highly learned and

---

[1] *EI*, VI (Kielhorn), No. 1, pp. 1-12.

[2] See the *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, Vol. XXIII, p. 564.

[3] A number of gurus of this name are known to have lived in later times. See *NKC*, Pt. I, Introduction, p. 25.

[4] See the author's article: 'Pūjyapada of the Chalukyan Records' (*JA*, XIX. 1, pp. 16 ff.)

[5] See S. C. Vidyabhusana, *A History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*; Introductions to *NKC*, Pt. I and II, *Akalaṅka Granthatraya* and *Rājavārttika*.

[6] ibid. In particular the inscription of 1128 (*EC*, II. 97, p. 17) styles him as one 'through whom the Jaina doctrine which had been stainless from the beginning, became resplendent without any stain.'

voluminous commentary on the *Tattvārtha-sūtra* of Umāsvāmin;
Aṣṭaśatī—a learned commentary in 800 verses on the *Āptamīmāṁsā* of Samantabhadra;
Laghīstriya;
Nyāyaviniścaya;
Siddhiviniścaya and
Pramāṇasaṁgraha.

A number of other works are also attributed to him but such of them as are available seem to be the creations of later writers. All his works are in Sanskrit.

Like other great masters of old, Akalaṅka gives but little information about himself. In several of his works he gives only his name, but in a verse found in his *Tattvārtha-rājavārttika* he also informs us that he was the son of a king named Laghu Havva.[1] An old Sanskrit work, *Akalaṅkacarita* together with *Akalaṅkāṣṭaka* (a poem of 8 verses) attributed to Akalaṅka, but probably written not very long after his death by some admirer of his, gives a brief account of Akalaṅka's exploits against the Buddhists, which he is made to relate himself in the court of some Rājan Sāhasatuṅga.[2] The date of this great event is also given in it as V.E. 700 (or A.D. 643).[3] A number of writers and epigraphic records beginning from the 10th century refer to this

---

[1] जीयाच्चिरमकलङ्क ब्रह्मा लघुहव्वनृपतिवर तनयः। ,
अनवरत निखिल विद्वज्जन नुतविद्यःप्रशस्त जनहृद्य. ॥
—cf., Hiralal, *Cat. Mss.*, Introduction, p. XXVI.

[2] See *EC*, II, Introduction, pp. 48, 84; Fleet, *Dyn. Kan. Dts.* (Ist ed.), pp. 32-33.

[3] विक्रमाङ्क शकाब्दीय शतसप्त प्रमाजुषि।
कालेऽकलङ्क यतिनोबौद्धर्वादो महानभूत ॥
Also see R. Narsimhachar, *Inscs. at Sr. Belgola* (2nd ed.), Introduction.

disputation and his remarkable victory over the Buddhist scholars.[1] In particular, the Malliṣeṇa epitaph of A.D. 1128 gives fuller details, confirms the account of *Akalaṅkacarita* and tells that the Buddhist scholar had sought the help of goddess Tārā at the time of the disputation which was held in the court of King Himaśītala. The verse giving the date is also quoted in this record.[2] The *Kathākoṣa* of Prabhācandra (11th century) gives the name of Akalaṅka's patron as king Subhatunga of Mānyakheṭa and tells that his father was one Puruṣottama, the Brahmin minister of that king, and that the disputation took place in the city of Ratnasañcayapura in the presence of King Himaśītala of Kaliṅga.[3] The *Kathākoṣas* of Śrīcandra and Nemidatta more or less repeat the same account.[4] The Kannada *Himaśītalakathe* or *Akalaṅkacarite* (A.D.1800)[5], the *Bhuvanapradīpikā* (A.D. 1808)[6] and the *Rājāvalī-kathe*[7] agree in general details with the version of the *Kathākoṣas*, but they differ in some names and make Akalaṅka a Tamil or at best a Kannadiga and not a Maharashtrian as the *Kathākoṣas* seem to imply. They are also silent about Sāhasatunga and make Himaśītala a king of Kāñci, who, in consequence of Akalaṅka's victory, is said to have turned a Jaina and persecuted the Buddhists. The *Bhuvanapradīpikā* makes Himaśītala a king of Tuṇḍīradeśa and gives his date as Kali 1125 Piṅgala.

[1] *MAR*, 1923, p. 15 (10th century); *EC*, II. 64, p. 17; *EC*. II. 67, etc. Among writers, Vādirāja (1025 A.D.), Ajita Brahma, Ajitasena and Śubhacandra refer to this event.

[2] *EC*, II. 67, p. 27; Sr. Bl. Insc., No. 54 of 1128.

[3] Hiralal, *Cat. Mss.*, introd., p. 26.

[4] ibid., p. 19.

[5] vide., Rice, *My. & Cg.*, pp. 200-01.

[6] *MAR*, 1918, p. 68.

[7] Rice, *My. & Cg.*, op. cit.

Ajitasena in the colophon of his *Nyāyamaṇidīpikā* locates the site of the disputation as the Mahāsthāna of Sakalarājādhirāja Parameśvara Himaśītala.[1] Peterson alleged knowledge of some tradition which made Akalaṅka the son of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I (A.D. 756-72).[2]

With the above facts together with Akalaṅka's own contemporaneity, priority and posteriority to a number of well-known Jaina, Buddhist and Brahmanical scholars referring to or referred to by him as basis, there have been hot discussions and controversies as regards the date and nationality of Akalaṅka and identity of his patrons (viz., Sāhasatuṅga and Himaśītala). In modern times, Col. Mackenzie was perhaps the first to take historical notice of this guru.[3] On the basis of his references, Wilson surmised that 'in the 8th century Akalaṅka, a Jaina teacher from Sravaṇa Belgola, who had been partly educated in the Boudha College at Pontaga (near Trivattur), disputed with the Boudhas in the presence of the last Boudha prince Himaśītala (at Kāñcī) and having confuted them, the prince became a Jaina and the Boudhas were banished to Candy.'[4] Following Wilson, John Murdoch fixed the date of this event in *c.* A.D. 800[5], while Robert Sewell fixed it exactly in A.D. 788.[6] B.L. Rice supported this theory and had no doubt as to Himaśītala's being a Pallava King of Kāñcī, but he also suggested that the Jainas themselves had for the date 'the immemorial sentence *Sapta Sailādri*', etc. which gives S.E. 777 (A.D. 855), and admit-

[1] See *Praśasti-saṁgraha* (Arrah, 1942), p. 1.

[2] Peterson's Report, No. 2, p. 79; Altekar, *RTT*, p. 409.

[3] *Col. Mackenzie's Collection of MSS.* (Cat., Vol. III, pp. 423-36).

[4] *The Mackenzie Collections*, Introduction, p. 40.

[5] *Classified Cat. of Tamil Printed Books* (1865), pp. 65-66.

[6] *A Sketch of the Dynasties of South India*, p. 73.

ted his inability to identify the king named Sāhasatuṅga.[1] Since then no one has questioned this identification of Himaśītala and a majority of scholars have also accepted the date A.D. 788.[2]

As regards Sāhasatuṅga, K.B. Pathak at first identified him with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I (A.D. 756-72) and S.C. Vidyabhusana supported him.[3] Later on, Pathak revised his opinion and identified that king with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga (A.D. 745-56).[4] Since then nobody has questioned this identification either. Only Altekar and Upadhye call it merely conjectural.[5]

In recent times several scholars have, however, dissented from this general view about Akalaṅka's date being the latter part of the 8th century and have tried to prove that the traditional date (i.e., V.E. 700=A.D.

[1] B. L. Rice, *Inscs. at Sr. Belgola* (Bangalore, 1889), Introduction, p. 45; also see his *Mysore Inscs.*, p. 56; *Pampa Rāmāyaṇa*, Introduction, p. 3. He seems to have got some version of the verse quoted above, which had the words *Sapta Śailādri* instead of *Sapta Śata Pramājuṣi*.

[2] Amongst others, S. K. Ayengar gives A.D. 855 (*Ancient India*, p. 269); R. G. Bhandarkar, A.D. 778 (*Report*, 1889, p. 31); Vidyabhusana, A.D. 750 (*Hist. MSIL*, p. 26); N.R. Premi, A.D. 753-75 (*JH*, XI, pp. 7-8); K. B. Pathak, A.D. 744-82 (*ABORI*, XI. 2, pp. 153); Altekar, A.D. 780 (*RTT*, p. 409), Mahendra Kumar, A.D. 720-80 (*NKC*, pt. I, Introduction).

[3] *History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*, p. 26.

[4] *ABORI*. XI. 2, p. 155. In 1905 the Madras Government Epigraphist had also surmised that the epithet Sāhasatuṅga used in the Rameswara temple record probably refers to Dantidurga who might be identical with the Sāhasatuṅga of the Akalaṅka tradition (cf., *Ep. Rep.*, Southern Circle for 1905, p. 49). Dr. B. A. Saletore made this undated and damaged Rameswara temple record, which was inscribed at least two hundred years after the times of Dantidurga, the chief basis for identifying Sāhasatuṅga with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga and for fixing the age of Akalaṅka. ('The Age of Guru Akalaṅka', *JBHS*, VI, pp. 10-35).

[5] Altekar, *RTT*, p. 409; Upadhye, *ABORI*, XIV, p. 164, f.n. 5.

643) might be correct.[1] Among these, K.C. Sastri, chiefly on the basis of references by and to Akalaṅka found in his own works and in those of other Jaina and non-Jaina scholars of those centuries, has tried to show that Akalaṅka could not but have lived in the 7th century A.D.[2] These scholars, however, touched neither the Himaśītala nor the Sāhasatuṅga part of the Akalanka tradition nor did they try to explore the historicity of the traditional date of A.D. 643.

A close examination of the original sources, traditions and modern discussions relating to this great master, however, brings out the following facts.

Akalaṅka is the commentator of Umāsvāmi (1st century A.D.) and Samantabhadra (2nd century), and he refers to or quotes from Śrīdatta (*c.* A.D. 400), Devanandi Pūjyapāda (A.D. 464-524), Siddhasena Divākara (A.D. 550-600), Mallavādī (A.D. 600) and Pātrakesari (*c.* A.D. 575-625).[3]

Among non-Jaina scholars he quotes from, criticises or refers to, Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (2nd century B.C.), Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakoṣa* (*c.* A.D. 400), Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* (A.D. 345-425) and Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* (A.D. 590-650).[4]

His well-known commentators are Abhayacandra (12th century), Prabhācandra (A.D. 980-1065), Vādirāja (A.D. 1025), Anantavīrya II (*c.* A.D. 825), Vidyā-

---

[1] S. Srikantha Sastri gives A.D. 645 (*ABORI*, XII. 3, p. 255); J. K. Mukhtar, A.D. 640 (*Svāmi Samantabhadra*, p. 125); A. N. Upadhye, last quarter of 7th century (*ABORI*, XIV, p. 164, f.n.).

[2] K. C. Sastri's Introduction to *NKC*, Pt. II.

[3] ibid., also introd. to pt. I, to *Akalaṅka-granthatraya*, to *Rājavārttika* and to *Parīkṣāmukham* (S. G. Ghoshal), as also Pathak and Vidyabhusana, op. cit.

[4] ibid.

nandi (A.D. 775-825) and Anantavīrya I (*c.* A.D. 700); and he is praised or alluded to in the *Ādipurāṇa* (*c.* A.D. 850), the *Anekāntajayapatākā* of Haribhadra (A.D. 725-825), the *Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783), the *Dhavala* (*c.* A.D. 780) and the *Tattvārthabhāṣya* of Siddhasenagaṇi (*c.* A.D. 750).[1] Jinadāsa Mahattara, who completed his *Nandi-cūrṇi* in S.E. 598 (or A.D. 676), also seems to praise Akalaṅka's *Siddhiviniścaya* as a *prabhāvaka śāstra* in his *Niśītha-cūrṇi*.[2]

A comparative study of the works of Bhartṛhari (A.D. 590-650), Dharmakīrtti (A.D. 635-50) and Kumārila (A.D. 600-660) with those of Akalaṅka suggests that they all might have been contemporaries, living rivals and philosophical antagonists. They seem to criticise and refer to one another.

The traditional date V.E. 700 is at least as old as the 9th century.

The *Bhuvanapradīpikā* gives the date as Kali 1125 Piṅgala. A popular tradition makes the Kali era start with the accession of the first Nanda. Jaina tradition as preserved in the *Harivaṁśa* places that event 425 years before Vikrama. Hence 1125 minus 425 gives 700. And the Samvatsara in that year actually happened to be Piṅgala.

The inscription of A.D. 1128 mentions that after Akalaṅka there lived his colleague Puspasena whose disciple was Vimalacandra, a great disputant associated with the court of a king named 'Śatrubhayankara.' Vimalacandra's grand-disciple was Parvā-

---

[1] ibid.

[2] *NKC*, Pt. II, Introduction; *PJVS*, Introduction, p. 110; *Sanmati-tarka*, Introduction, pp. 35-36; *Jaiselmere Bhandāra Sūcī* (Baroda), p. 18. The same is alluded to in the *Vṛtti* on *Jītakalpa-cūrṇi* (of A.D. 676) by Śrīcandasūri.

dimalla, a great logician associated with another king named Kṛṣṇarāja.[1] Scholars believing Akalaṅka to have lived in the 8th century have wrongly identified these kings with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govind III (A.D. 793-814) and Kṛṣṇa II (A.D. 884-914) respectively.[2] This Parvādimalla or Mallavādī wrote a commentary on the *Ṭippaṇa* by the Buddhist scholar Dharmottara (A.D. 725-50) on the *Nyāyabindu*[3], and his grand-disciple appears as donee in the Surat plates of Karka, dated S.E. 743 (A.D. 821).[4] Hence this Kṛṣṇarāja can be none else but Kṛṣṇa I (A.D. 758-73). Similarly, the king Śatrubhayaṅkara appears to be the Gaṅga monarch Śrīpuruṣa Muttarasa (A.D. 726-777) who has been given the epithet of Aribhayankara (a synonym of Śatrubhayaṅkara) in several Gaṅga records one of which belongs to this king's own reign and is dated S.E. 698 (or A D. 776).[5] This record also mentions Vimalacandra and indicates that this guru must have lived prior to the middle of the 8th century.

A number of Cālukyan records of the late 7th and early 8th century mention the disciples and grand-disciples of one Pūjyapāda of the Devagaṇa, who is said to have been a native of Alaktakanagara (modern Altem in Maharashtra).[6] There is little doubt

---

[1] *EC*, II. 67, pp. 27-28. Also see *EC*, VIII, Nr. 35, pp. 138-42.

[2] *MJ*, pp. 36-37; *EC*, II. 67, Introduction, p. 48.

[3] S. C. Vidyabhusana, op. cit., p. 34; *PJVS*, Introduction, p. 149; *Varṇī Volume*, p. 204.

[4] *EI*, Vol. XXI, No. 22, pp. 133 ff.

[5] *EC*, IV, Ng. 85, pp. 135-36; also Introduction, p. 9; *MJ*, pp. 88, 155.

[6] *IA*, XII, pp. 19-21; VII, p. 112; XXX, p. 106; D. C. Sircar, *Successors of the Satavahanas*, p. 300; *MJ*, pp. 41-42; *JA*, XIII. 2, p. 33; *MAR*, 1921, pp. 23-24.

that this guru was none else than Akalaṅka himself.[1] Even Vīrasena in his *Dhavala* (A.D. 780) referred to and quoted from him under that name.[2] Akalaṅka was a great pontiff and belonged to the Devagaṇa, not to the Deśīya or Nandigaṇa.[3] He and his successors enjoyed royal patronage, principally of the Western Cālukyas of Bādāmi and seem to have been the heads of a great centre of learning situated in or near the Cālukyan capital, probably at Aihole or Alaktakanagara.

King Sāhasatunga, the patron of Akalaṅka, appears to have been identical with the Western Cālukyan emperor Vikramāditya I (A.D. 642-81), the son and successor of Pulakeśin II (A.D. 606-42).

Similarly, King Himaśītala of the Akalanka tradition seems to have been identical with the Trikaliṅgādhipati of Hiuen Tsang's time (A.D. 643).[4] The traditions relating to Akalaṅka, the political history of the 2nd and 3rd quarters of the 7th century, the then religious conditions and inter-communal relations, inscriptional evidence and Hiuen Tsang's valuable testimony lead to the conclusion that most probably the historic disputation of Akalaṅka with the Buddhist scholars was held in the court of the king of Kaliṅga about the middle of the 7th century A.D.

---

[1] cf., J. P. Jain, 'Pūjyapāda of the Chalukyan Records', *JA*, XIX. 1, pp. 16 ff.

[2] ibid.

[3] See *Harivamśa Purāṇa* (I. 31); Bhandarkar, *Principal Results etc.*, List 1889, p. 31; Introduction to *NKC*, Pts. I & II, and to *Akalaṅka-granthatraya*.

[4] cf., J. P. Jain, 'The Trikaliṅgādhipati of Hiuen Tsang's Times and King Himaśītala of the Akalaṅka Tradition,' *JUPHS*, Vol. III (New Series), pt. 2, pp. 108-125.

Tradition gives the name of Akalaṅka's guru as Ravigupta who might be identical with Ravikīrtti of the Aihole inscription (A.D. 634). The Buddhist college where Akalaṅka is said to have studied might be that of Kanheri.

The date of Akalaṅka would thus be *circa* A.D. 625-75 and that of his disputation with the Mahāyānī Buddhists of Kalinga at Ratnapura on the Diamond Coast might well have been A.D. 643.

JINADASAGANI MAHATTARA is the author of several *Cūrṇis* on the *Āgama-sūtras*. These *Cūrṇis* contain useful material for the students of history[1] and as has been seen, seem to contain references to Siddhasena Divākara and Akalanka, which help us to fix the dates of these scholars.[2] On the other hand, Haribhadra (8th century) quotes at length from these *Cūrṇis*.[3] At the end of a very old manuscript of the *Nandi-cūrni* the date of its completion is given as S.E. 598 (or A.D. 676).[4] The date of his *Niśītha-cūrṇi* is also found to be V.E. 733 (or A.D. 676).[5]

RAVISENA is the author of the *Padmacarita* (18,000 verses divided into 123 parvas) which is the earliest available Jaina *Purāṇa* in Sanskrit giving the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[6] The work appears to be an elaborate

---

[1] See J. C. Jain, *Life in Ancient India as depicted in the Jaina Canons*, Bombay, 1947.

[2] *NKC*, Pt. II, Introduction.

[3] *JSS*, I. 1, p. 50.

[4] *PJVS*, Introduction, p. 119; *NKC*, Pt. II, Introduction; *Sanmati-tarka*, Introduction, pp. 35-36.

[5] 'विक्रम सवत् ७३३ वर्षे रचितायां निशीथ चूर्ण्यां अवतरणानि हरिभद्र-सूरीयावश्यक वृत्तौ दृश्यन्ते .'

—*Jaiselmere Bhaṇḍāra Sūci* (Baroda), p. 18.

[6] Published by M.D.J.G, Bombay, V.E. 1985; also see *JSB*, I. 2-3, p. 37.

translation of Vimala Sūri's Prākṛt *Paum-cariu*. Raviṣeṇa and his work have been referred to by poet Dhavala (11th century), Svayambhu (*c.* A.D. 790), Jinasena II (A.D. 783) and Udyotana Sūri (A.D. 778).[1] Fortunately Raviṣeṇa gives the date of the completion of his work in the Mahāvīra era, after the manner of Vimala Sūri, as M.E. 1203 (or A.D. 676).[2] There is no reason to doubt the correctness of this date. He also gives the names of his four immediate predecessors.[3] His work is an important source for the cultural history of ancient India and for a comparative study of the different currents of the story of the *Rāmāyana*.

JATASIMHANANDI, JATACHARYA OR JATILA is the author of *Varāṅgacarita* which is an excellent and perhaps the earliest available Sanskrit Purāṇic Kāvya of the Caritra type.[4] It is assigned to the 7th century A.D. In fact, all the later writers who mention Raviseṇa also mention this author and his work. The cultural importance of this work is also being realised.[5]

JOINDU (YOGINDU) is perhaps the earliest known author who wrote in Apabhraṁśa. He was a great mystic poet and saint, a forerunner of the mediaeval mystic saint-poets. His well-known works are the

---

[1] See Dhavala's Apabhraṁśa *Harivaṁśa*; Jinasena's *Harivaṁśa-purāṇa* (I. 340); Udyotana's *Kuvalayamālā*, v. 41.

[2] द्विशताभ्यधिके समासहस्रे समतीतेऽर्धं चतुर्थवर्षं (१२०३½) युक्ते।
जिनभास्कर वर्द्धमान सिद्धे चरित पद्ममुनेरिद निबद्धम्॥

—*Padmacarita*, ch. 123, v. 185.

[3] आसीदिन्द्र गुरोर्दिवाकर यतिःशिष्योऽस्य चार्हन्मुनि।
तस्माल्लक्ष्मणसेन सन्मुनिरदः शिष्यो रविस्तत्स्मृत ॥१६॥

—ibid.

[4] Dr. A. N. Upadhye's edition, Bombay, 1938. Also see *ABORI*, XIV. 1-2; *Jaina Jagata*, VIII. 7, p. 20.

[5] See *JA*, XII. 2, pp. 45-52.

Parmappapayasa (*Paramātma-prakāśa*) and *Jogasāra*.[1] Earliest known references to him are found in the works of Jayasena (A.D. 1150-1200) and Hemacandra (A.D. 1083-1173). Devasena (A.D. 933) bears visible traces of his influence. On the other hand, Joindu freely borrows from the *Mokṣapāhuḍa* of Kundakunda (Ist century) and the *Samādhi Śataka* of Pūjyapāda (A.D. 464-524). And since Caṇḍa in his *Prākṛta-lakṣaṇa*, the last recension of which dates A.D. 700, is found quoting a verse (I. 85) from the *Paramātma-prākaśa* of Joindu[2], the latter may safely be assigned to the close of the 7th century A.D.

PADMANANDI is the author of the *Jambudvīpa-prajñapti-saṁgraha*, an old Prākrt text on the subject of cosmology, which also contains much useful information about ancient geography and Jaina traditions.[3] In the colophon at the end of the work the author tells us that he was the disciple of Balanandi, the disciple of Vīranandi, and that he had studied the subject from Śrī Vijayaguru, the disciple of Sakala Candra, the disciple of the famous Māghanandi, in the city of Bārā situated in the country of Pārijāta when Satti, the lord of Bārānagar, was ruling over that region.[4] Unfortunately he gives no dates and it is very difficult to identify the names. Opinions differ as regards his date, but a close examination of the details supplied by him in-

---

[1] See Introduction to *Paramātma-prakāśa*, ed. A N Upadhye, R.J.S., Bombay, 1937.

[2] ibid Upadhye places him in the 6th century, while M C. Modi in the 10th (*Apabhramśa-pāthāvali*, notes, pp. 76-79).

[3] See *IHQ*, XIV, pp. 188 ff, ibid., XIV. 2, pp. 388-91; *PJVS*, Introduction, pp. 64-67.

[4] *JSS*, I. 4, pp. 144-50; *JSI*, pp. 256-59 (colophon reproduced); *JA*, IV. 3, pp. 81-84.

clines us to assign this author to *circa* A.D. 700. His Bārānagar seems to be identical with the town of Bāran in the Kota district of Rajasthan.

APARAJITASURI OR SRIVIJAYA is the author of the *Vijayodayā* which is the earliest available and authoritative commentary on the *Bhagavatī-ārādhanā* of Śivārya.[1] He belonged to the Yāpanīya Nandi Saṁgha and was the disciple of Baladevasūri, the disciple of Candranandi.[2] The author's guru seems to be identical with Padmanandi's guru, Balanandi. Śrīvijaya would thus belong to *circa* A.D. 700.

DHANANJAYA, the famous poet and author of the *Dvi-sandhāna-kāvya*, *Anekārtha-nāmamālā* and *Viṣāpahāra-stotra*, mentions Pūjyapāda and Akalaṅka (A.D. 625-75) and is himself quoted by Vīrasena in his *Dhavala* (A.D. 780).[3] Hence he would also belong to *circa* A.D. 700.

SIDDHASENA III, the author of *Nyāyāvatāra*, a small but important treatise on the science of logic, containing 32 verses in Sanskrit, is a Śvetāmbara scholar who is generally, though wrongly, identified with Siddhasena Divākara (*c.* A.D. 550-600), the author of the *Sanmati*, as also with Siddhasena Kṣapaṇaka (*c.* A.D. 425),

---

[1] Published by N. R. Premi, Bombay, 1933, and from Solapur in 1935.

[2] See *JSI*, pp. 31-32; *PJVS*, Introduction, p. 66; *Anekānta*, II. 1, pp. 57-60.

[3] प्रमाणमकलङ्कस्य पूज्यपादस्य लक्षणम् ।
धनञ्जयकवे काव्य त्रिरत्नमपश्चिमम् ॥

—*Nāmamālā.*

The verse quoted from the same work in *Dhavala* is:

हेतावेव प्रकाराद्यै. व्यवच्छेदे विपर्यय. ।
प्रादुर्भावे समाप्ते च इतिशब्द विदुर्बुधा ॥

He is also praised by poet Rājaśekhara, the author of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* (cf., *JSI*, p. 465).

the author of the *Dvātriṁśikās*.[1] His earliest commentator is Siddharṣi (A.D. 905) and the *Nyāyāvatāra* bears visible traces of the influence of Pātrakesari (*c.* A.D. 600) and Dharmakīrti (A.D. 635-50) and of even Dharmottara (A.D. 725-50).[2] Haribhadra (*c.* A.D. 725-825) does not mention this work or its author. Hence he would belong to *circa* A.D. 700-750.

SIDDHASENAGANI, the author of the earliest and the biggest Śvetāmbara commentary on the *Tattvārtha* of Umāsvāmin, is also the first to allege the existence of the *Svopajña Bhāṣya* on that work. According to the colophon of his work, Siddhasenagaṇi was the disciple of Bhāsvāmi, the disciple of Siṁhasvāmi. The latter is said to have written a Ṭīkā on the *Nayacakra* of Mallavādī (*c.* A.D. 600). Siddhasenagaṇi mentions Vasubandhu (A.D. 450), Dharmakīrti and Akalaṅka (A.D. 625-75) and he himself is mentioned in the *Ācārāṅga-vṛtti* of Śīlāṁka (A.D. 858-76) but is mentioned nowhere by Haribhadra (*c.* A.D. 725-825).[3] Hence he would belong to *circa* A.D. 750.

[1] See Dr. P. L. Vaidya's edition of *Nyāyāvatāra* (1928); S. C. Vidyabhusana, *A History of Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*, also his Introduction to *Nyāyavatāra*, edited by him; *Sanmati-tarka*, Introduction, op. cit.

[2] ibid. Also Jacobi's Introd. to *Samaraicca-kahā*, *PJVS*, Introduction, pp. 141-42.

[3] Introduction to the *Tattvārthasūtra*, ed. Sukhlal, Banaras, 1952.

CHAPTER X

AUTHORS OF THE RĀṢṬRAKŪṬA AGE

THE period between the accession of Dantidurga (*c.* A.D. 733) and the end of Amoghavarṣa I (A.D. 876 or 884) marked the zenith of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power which was at that time the most extensive, prosperous and powerful empire in the whole of India. The same period produced a marvellous galaxy of Jaina authors who were patronised by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas or other kings of the time and who produced in different languages and on different subjects a large number of valuable works many of which are likely to prove useful sources not only for cultural but also for political history of the times. The more important of these authors are :—

SVAMI VIRASENA, one of the most important names in the history of Jaina literature, is the greatest, most well-known and probably the last commentator of the Digambara canon. The voluminous and highly learned works of Vīrasena, viz., the *Dhavala*, the *Jayadhavala* and the *Mahādhavala*, written in Prākṛt and Sanskrit mixed, were lying locked up in palm-leaf manuscripts in the Siddhānta Basadi Maṭha of Mūḍabidri in South Kanara for the past 800 years or so and were merely an object of worship for the pilgrims. It is only recently that the work of their publication in well-edited standard editions has started. More than a dozen big volumes have come out.[1] As Dr. Ghatge observes, "This has brought about a radical change in our ideas of the literary history

[1] *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* with *Dhavala* commentary, ed. Dr. H. L. Jain, published by J.S.U.F., Amroati. *Jayadhavala* (*Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa*), Jaina Saṁgha, Mathura. *Mahādhavala*, Bharatiya Jnanapitha, Kasi, 1947.

of the Digambaras and their relation to the Śvetāmbaras. These voluminous commentaries embody much traditional information and even earlier literary works of their predecessors on the ancient *Sūtras* of Puṣpadanta, Bhūtabali, Guṇadhara, etc."[1] In fact, Vīrasena was not only a great pontiff and the head of a flourishing centre of learning of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire but was also a versatile genius and a literary prodigy. The numerous quotations and references used by him show his thorough acquaintance with almost the whole range of Jaina literature that had been produced prior to his times.[2]

Fortunately he gives some information about himself in the colophon at the end of his *Dhavala*, but it is somewhat damaged and full of copyist's mistakes. It tells us that 'Vīrasena, who was a disciple of Āryanandi and a grand-disciple of Candrasena of the Pañcastūpa-anvaya, who was proficient in Siddhānta, Chanda, Vyākaraṇa, Jyotiṣa and Pramāṇaśāstra, and who had studied the Siddhānta from Elācārya, wrote and completed this commentary, the *Dhavala*, in V.E. 838, on the 13th day of the bright fortnight of Kārttika when the Lagna was in the 7th zodiac sign (Tulā), Sūrya, Budha and Guru were in the same sign and in the first house, Śani was in Kumbha with Rāhu, Maṅgala in Dhanu, Śukra in Simha and Candra in Mīna, in the territory directly governed by Jagatuṅgadeva in the empire of Boddaṇarāya Narendra, Narendra Cūḍāmaṇi.'[3]

---

[1] Presidential Address of Dr. A. M. Ghatge in AIOC, Darbhanga session.

[2] See *Ṣatkhaṇḍāgama*, op. cit., I. 1. i, Introduction; also *Jayadhavala*, op. cit., Vol. I, Introduction.

[3] जस्स सेसाण्णमये सिद्धतमिदि हि अहिल्हुदी।
मह्नु सो एलाइरिओ पसियउ वर वीरसेणस्स॥१॥

We identify this emperor with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruva Dhārāvarṣa (A.D. 779-93). Govinda III Jagatuṅga as the heir-designate was in charge of the military headquarters of Mayūrakhaṇḍī and ruled as his father's viceroy over the Nāsikadeśa (region).[1] The colophon of the *Jayadhavala*, completed in A.D. 837 by Vīrasena's disciple Jinasena, which is supported by the *Srutāvatāras*, the *Paṭṭāvalis* and other works, states that Vīrasena lived and wrote his works in the Candraprabhu temple of

---

अज्जणदि सिस्सेणुज्जुव कम्मस्स चदसेणस्स।
तहणत्तुवेण पचत्थूहण्णय भाणुणमुणिणा ॥४॥
सिद्धतछद जोइस वायरण पमाणसत्थणिवुणेण।
भट्टारएण टीका लिहिएसा वीरसेणेण ॥५॥
अट्ठतीसम्हि सासिय विक्कमरायम्हि एसुसगरमो (वसुसत्तोरमे)।
पासे (वासे) सुतेरसीए भावविलग्गं (भाणुविलग्गे) घवलपक्खे ॥६॥
जगतुग देवरज्जे रियम्हि (रविजम्हि) कुभम्हिराहुणा कोणे।
सूरे तुलाए मते गुरुम्हि कुलविल्लए होते ॥७॥
चावम्हि वरणिवुत्ते (धरणिवुत्ते) सिघे सुक्कम्मिणेमि (मीणे) चदम्मि।
कत्तियमासे एसा टीकाहु समाणिआ घवला ॥८॥
बोद्दणराय णरिंदे णरिंद चूडामणिम्हि भुजते।
सिद्धतगथ मत्थियगुरु पसायेण विगत्ता सा ॥९॥

—Colophon of the *Dhavala*.

The relevant portions which appeared to be corrupt have been underlined and their corrected versions given in brackets against them. We have cast the complete horoscope and checked and verified it. The date thus arrived at is Monday, October 16, A.D. 780 (S. K. Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris*, I. ii, p. 165). Herein we have differed from the editors of the *Dhavala* and the *Jayadhavala* who have taken the era used to be the Śaka era, and hence believe the date to have been Śaka 738 or A.D. 816. We have discussed their arguments fully and have shown their assumptions and conclusions to be incorrect. (See 'Śrī Dhavala Kā Samaya,' *Anekānta*, VII. 7-8, pp. 207-14).

[1] The editors of the *Dhavala* and the *Jayadhavala* have also wrongly identified the Boddaṇarāya of the colophon with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I (A.D. 815-76). [See Introductions to Vol. I of both of them; also J. P. Jain, 'Dhavala Praśasti ke Rāṣṭrakūṭa Nareśa', *Anekanta*, VIII. 2, pp. 97-101].

Vāṭagrāmapura[1] which we have identified with village Vānī in Ḍinḍori *taluka* of Nasik district and which also figures in contemporary Rāṣṭrakūṭa records under the name of Vāṭanagara Viṣaya of Nāsikadeśa.[2] The Pañcastūpa-anvaya is an ancient line of Jaina gurus, which originally seems to have belonged to the north, derived from Mathura or Hastināpur, and extended up to Varanasi and Bengal. A branch seems to have migrated to the Deccan in the 6th or 7th century A.D.[3] From the 9th century onwards the gurus of this Anvaya seem to have changed its name into that of the Senagaṇa. The *Srutāvatāras* tell us that Vīrasena had studied the Siddhānta from Elācārya who was a native of Citrakūṭapura.[4] It seems to be no other place than Chittor in Rajasthan. Vīrasena himself seems to have originally belonged to this place and to have later on migrated to and settled in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa territories in the ancient Cāmbhār-leṇa caves of Vāṭagrāma in the vicinity of Nasik. There is evidence of the existence of an Elācārya about the middle of the 8th century A.D.[5] Similarly a Candrasena appears to have lived in the last

[1] See colophon to *Jayadhavala*, v. 6, (Vol. I, Introduction); Indranandi's *Srutāvatāra*, v. 179; *Mahābandha*, Introduction, p. 13; *Senagaṇa-paṭṭāvali* (*JA*, XIII. 2, p. 4), etc.

[2] J. P. Jain, 'The Birthplace of *Dhavala* and *Jayadhavala*,' *JA*, XV. 2, pp. 46-57, other scholars have, however, identified this place with either Mānyakheta (see *JBBRAS*, XVIII, p. 226; *JSI*, p. 497, *Jinaratnakoṣa*, p. 133) or with Baroda in Gujarat (see *Jayadhavala*, Vol. I, Introduction).

[3] See *JSB*, XVI. 1, pp. 1-6; Pahārpur Insc. of G. E. 159 (*EI*, XX, pp. 59-64), *EC*, II. 75, pp. 38, 40-41, J. P. Jain, *Hastināpur*.

[4] This too has been differently identified with Chittaladurga in Deccan or Citrakūta in Madhya Bhārata, but these identifications seem to be wrong. To us Chittor appears to be the likely place as it was also called Citrakūṭapur and was a flourishing Jaina centre in those days.

[5] See J.P. Jain, 'The Predecessors of Svāmi Vīrasena,' *JA*, XII. 1, pp. 1-6.

quarter of the 7th century[1] and an Āryanandi in the first half of the 8th century.[2] Vīrasena refers to and quotes from Akalaṅka (A.D. 625-75)[3] and Dhanañjaya (c. A.D. 700).[4] He himself is alluded to by Jinasena II in his *Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783)[5] and by Vidyānandi in his *Aṣṭasahasrī* (A.D. 792).[6] The latter appears to allude to Vīrasena's recent demise. Vīrasena had a large number of colleagues and disciples[7], the greatest favourite, though perhaps the youngest of them all, was Jinasena III who completed the *Jayadhavala* in A.D. 837. Vīrasena must have taken some 25 years to complete that voluminous work and about as long to prepare himself for that specialised task. His library was very well equipped. He is also said to have written a mathematical treatise named *Siddhabhū-paddhati*[8] and was probably responsible for the present recension of the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*. Svāmi Vīrasena would thus belong to *circa* A.D. 710-90. He was evidently patronised by the Rāstrakūṭa emperor Dhruva and the crown-prince Jagatunga.

Haribhadra Suri is perhaps the greatest Svetāmbara scholar and author of these centuries. He was a

---

[1] ibid.

[2] ibid.

[3] See J.P. Jain, 'Pūjyapāda of the Chalukyan Records,' *JA*, XIX. 1; XX. 1.

[4] See p. 183.

[5] जितात्म परलोकस्य कवीना चक्रवर्त्तिन ।
वीरसेनगुरो कीर्त्तिरकलङ्कावभासते ॥
—*Harivamśa*, 1.39.

[6] वीरसेनाख्य मोक्षगे चारुगुणानर्घ्यं रत्नसिधुगिरि सततम् ।
सारतरात्मध्यानगेमारमदाम्भोद पवनगिरिगव्हरयितु ॥
—*Aṣṭasahasrī*, Colophon.

Also see *Anekānta*, X. 7-8, pp. 278 ff.

[7] See *Mahāpurāṇa* (Kasi, 1951), pt. I, Introduction, pp. 30-31.

[8] Colophon to *Uttarapurāṇa* (A.D. 898), v. 6.

poet, philosopher, disputant and the first to write Sanskrit commentaries on the canonical texts. It is said that he wrote 1,444 works, big and small. Of these some 88 have so far been discovered and out of them 26 are definitely known to have been his creation.[1] He was a versatile genius and has been held in high esteem by posterity. It is said on good authority that before his times only one-eighth of the whole Śvetāmbara literature available today existed and to the remaining seven-eighths he was the greatest contributor and inspirer by example.[2] More important of his works are the canonical commentaries like the *Āvaśyaka-vṛtti*, *Nandi-vṛtti* and *Pañcasūtra-ṭīkā*. His other works are the *Anekānta-jaya-patākā*, *Ṣaṭ-darśana-samuccaya*, *Śāstravārtā-samuccaya*, *Yogavindu*, *Upadeśapada* and *Lalitavistara*. His *Samarāicca-kahā* is a fine Prākṛt Purāṇic Kāvya[3] and his *Dhūrtākhyāna* is an excellent satire.[4] He also wrote commentaries on some important non-Jaina works such as the *Nyāya-praveśa* of Diṅnāga. Haribhadra was a worthy successor of Akalanka, was as great a disputant and was also like him never virulent in his attacks against rival creeds or philosophers.

He appears to have been a native of Chittor, born in a learned Brahmin family. A nun by name Yākinī Mahattarā was instrumental in his conversion. Hence he is often styled as 'the son of Yākinī.' His guru was Jinadatta Sūri of the Vidyādhara gaccha.[5]

[1] See Jacobi's Introduction to *Samarāicca-kahā*; *Premī Volume*, p. 451; H. G. Das, *Haribhadra Carita*, *Jainagranthāvalī*.

[2] See *Anekānta*, III. 4, p. 289.

[3] ed. Dr. Hermann Jacobi.

[4] ed. Dr. A. N. Upadhye, S.J.G., Bombay, 1944.

[5] 'समाप्ताचेयं शिष्यसहिता नामावश्यकटीका कृतिः सितम्बराचार्य जिनभट निगदानुसारिणो विद्याधरकुलतिलक आचार्य जिनदत्तस्य शिष्यस्य धर्मतो याकिनी महत्तरासूनोरल्पमतेराचार्य हरिभद्रस्य।' —*Āvaśyakavṛtti*, colophon.

Haribhadra refers to and quotes not only from Siddhasena II and his *Sanmati* (*c.* A.D. 550-600) and several other authors prior to A.D. 600, but he also holds Akalaṅka (*c.* A.D. 625-75) in high respect and in his *Anekānta-jaya-patākā* often alludes to 'Akalaṅka's logic.'[1] He refutes Bhartṛhari (A.D. 590-650), Dharamakīrti (A.D. 635-50), Kumārila (A.D. 600-60) and even Dharmottara (A.D. 700-80). On the other hand, Udyotanasūri in his *Kuvalayamālā* (A.D. 778) admits himself to be a pupil of Haribhadra. Hence Muni Jinavijaya fixed Haribhadra's date as A.D. 700-70.[2] Dr. Jacobi has supported him.[3] But this date has got to be revised in view of the following facts.

Haribhadra in his *Anekānta-jaya-patākā-ṭīkā* mentions Mallavādī[4] and this Mallavādī appears to be the one who wrote a commentary on Dharmottara's *Ṭippaṇa* (A.D. 700-80) on Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyavindu*, and who mentions in that work of his, Vinītadeva (A.D. 775-800).[5]

Haribhadra has quoted a verse (गम्भीरगर्जितारम्भ..) in his *Ṣaṭ-darśana-samuccaya* from Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāya mañjarī* (*c.* A.D. 800).[6]

In Chapter 4 of his *Śāstravārtā-samuccaya* he alludes to Śāntarakṣita (A.D. 740-840) and his views.[7]

Hence the literary activities of Haribhadra must have extended beyond A.D. 800. He is reputed to have lived a long life and the fact that he had taught logic

---

[1] p. 202; also see *NKC*, Pt. II, Introduction.

[2] Jinavijaya, 'Date of Haribhadra', Summaries, AIOC, Poona, 1919, p. 124.

[3] Introduction to *Samarāicca-kahā*, op. cit.

[4] उक्तञ्च वादि मुख्येन मल्लवादिना।

[5] *PJVS*, Introduction, p. 149; Vidyabhusana, *Hist. Med. School of Ind. Logic*, p. 34.

[6] *PJVS*, Introduction, p. 150; *NKC*, Pt. I, Introduction.

[7] ibid.

to Udyotana (A.D. 778) need not be doubted. Haribhadra Sūri, therefore, seems to have lived in *circa* A.D. 725-825.

UDYOTANA SURI is the author of the famous Prakrit romance, *Kuvalayamālā*. Only two manuscripts of the work, one on palm-leaf and dated A.D. 1082 and the other belonging to the 15th century, have so far been discovered.[1] The work is very valuable as it supplies in the long colophon (27 verses) at its end much useful historical information.

Thus he tells us that the work was completed in the afternoon of the day preceding the end of the Śaka year 699 (i.e., March, A.D. 778), in the Ṛsabhadeva temple built by Śrī Ravibhadra in Jābālipur (Jalor) where lived many Jainas and which was adorned with many beautiful Jaina temples (vv. 18-20, 26); that the king of the country was Śrī Vatsarāja (v. 21); that he, Udyotana Sūri, styled as Dākṣiṇya-Ciñha and author of the *Kuvalayamālā*, was born in the lunar dynasty (चन्द्रकुलवंशोद्भूत) and was the son of Samprati, also known as Vedasāra, the son of the famous Udyotana who was the ruler of Mahādvārā (vv. 12, 24, 16, 17); that he was instructed in the doctrine by Vīrabhadra and in logic by Haribhadra, the author of many good books (vv. 13-15); that his guru was Tattvācārya (v. 11) whose guru Vedasāra had built a fine Jaina temple in Agāsavaṇā (Akāśa-vaprā) and who was the chief among Nāga, Vindī, Bhammaḍa, Dugga and Agniśarmā, the six disciples of the world famous Yajñadatta Jñānī whose many disciples adorned the Gurjaradeśa and had built many temples (vv. 10, 9, 8, 7); that the guru of this

[1] For the first, see *Jaisalmere Bhaṇḍāra Sūcī* (Baroda) and for the other, the *Cat. of Govt. Library*, Poona.

Yajñadatta was Śiva Candra Gaṇi who came to Bhinnamāla on pilgrimage (v. 6); that the guru of Śivacandra was Mahākavi Devagupta who, in his turn, was the disciple of Harigupta Ācārya born in the Gupta family (vv. 5, 4); that this Harigupta was also the spiritual preceptor of Tora-rāya (Rājarājeśvara-Siri Tora-rāya[māṇa], according to the Poona MS.) who ruled from the city of Pavvaiyā, situated on the banks of the Candrabhāgā (river Chenab in the Punjab) in the Uttarāpatha which abounds with scholars (vv. 1-3).[1]

The historical and chronological importance of this colophon of A.D. 778 is obvious. The author's native place Jābālipur (Jalor) seems to have had superseded Bhinnamāla as the capital of the Gurjara kings of Mārwāra. Vatsarāja of the colophon is none else but the Gurjara king of that name whose great-grandfather Nāgabhaṭṭa I or Nāgāvaloka had founded the kingdom of Bhinnamāla and had extended it up to Broach. He was a great conqueror; epigraphic records also speak of his glory.[2] Udyotana calls Vatsarāja as Nara-hasti and Para-bhaṭa-bhṛkuṭi-bhañjaka, which shows this king was also a great warrior. Another remarkable reference is to Rājarājeśvara Tora-rāya of Uttarāpatha.

---

[1] अत्थ पुहई पसिद्धा दोण्णि चेय देसत्ति।
तत्थत्थि पह णामेण उत्तरावह बुहजणइण्ण॥
सुइदिअ चारु सोहा बिअसिअकमलाणणा विमलदेहा।
तत्थत्थि जलहिदइआ सरिआ अह चदभायत्ति॥
तीरम्मि तीय पयडा पव्वइयाणाम णयर सोहिल्ला।
जत्थत्थि ठिए भुत्ता युदह सिरि तोरराएण॥
तस्सगुरु हरिउत्तोआयरिओ आसिगुत्तवंसओ।
तीय णयरीय दिण्णो जेण णिवेसोतहिं काले॥
तस्स विसिस्सो पयडो महाकई देवउत्त णामोत्ति। ....,etc.
For the full text of the colophon, see *JSB*, XX. 2, pp. 1-6.

[2] See *EI*, XII, pp. 202-03; also *ASI*, 1903-04, p. 28.

He is said to have been a contemporary of Harigupta who was the 7th in ascent from our author, and hence would belong to the beginning of the 6th century A.D. The inscriptions of the Hūṇa chief Toramāṇa place him in *circa* A.D. 480-510, which fact is also confirmed by the records of his son Mihirakula and those of Yaśodharman of Malwa.[1] These Hūṇas had their sway over the Punjab and were instrumental in bringing about the downfall of the Guptas. But it is an irony of fate that Harigupta, a scion of the Gupta family itself, came to be the spiritual conqueror of the ferocious Hūṇa. In fact, unlike his predecessors, Toramāṇa seems to have been a generous and tolerant king. He is known to have built a temple for Nārāyaṇa and a Vihāra for the Buddhists.[2] Here he is said to have been the devoted disciple of a Jaina saint. Toramāṇa seems to be identical with the Kalki's benevolent son who tried to efface the blemish of tyranny attached to his predecessor's name. Harigupta's successor, Mahākavi Devagupta, seems to be identical with the Rājarṣi Devagupta, the author of *Tripuruṣa-carita*, as mentioned in the beginning of *Kuvalayamālā* by Udyotana himself. A copper seal discovered in A.D. 1884 by Gen. Cunningham from Ahicchatra bears the name 'Mahārāja-Devaguptasya' and on the obverse it has the well-known Jaina symbol 'Puṣpa-Kalaśa.' It bears no traditional Gupta symbols of Vaishnava significance. This Devagupta is assigned to *circa* A.D. 550[3] and probably belonged to the later

[1] See the Eran Boar Insc. and the Kura stone insc. of Toramāna (Sircar, *Select Inscs.*); the Mandasor insc. of Yaśodharman and the Gwalior epitaph of Mihirakula (ibid.); also see *IA*, XVIII, pp. 225 ff.

[2] Inscs. of Toramāna, op. cit. (*CII*, II, No. 36, p. 158; No. 37, p. 161).

[3] See *JSB*, XX. 2, pp. 1-6.

Guptas of Ādityasena's line and came after Mahāsenagupta. There is every likelihood that all the three Devaguptas mentioned above are one and the same person. Pavvaiyā (modern Chāchera) on the Chinab[1] seems to have been a former capital of the Hūṇas, which was probably transferred by Mihirakula to Sākala (Siālkot). Akāśa-Vaprā seems to be identical with Vāḍanagara or Ānandapur in Gujarat which was surrounded by walls only in the times of Kumārapāla (about A.D. 1157).

Udyotana also mentions in his work many previous poets and authors along with their works.

JINASENA SURI PUNNATA is the author of the *Harivaṁśa-purāṇa* (10,000 ślokas, divided into 66 sargas) in Sanskrit.[2] This is one of the major, principal and early Jaina Purāṇas. Besides giving a detailed account of the ancient *Harivaṁśa* and the Jaina version of the events of the Mahābhārata age, not to say of the numerous anecdotes and stories revealing India's cultural past, the work is also very valuable as a source of history. The author, though a Purānakāra, is endowed with a remarkable historical sense and furnishes much useful information about himself and his times.

He tells us that he belonged to the Punnāṭagaṇa and was the disciple of Kīrtisena, a senior colleague of Amitasena who was the leader of that gaṇa. He also gives the pontifical succession for the traditional 683 years after the death of Mahāvīra. The above list ends in A.D. 156 after which Jinasena starts his own genea-

[1] Another plausible identification of Pavvaiyā may be with Padmāvati (or Pawaya near Gwalior) and in that case the Candrabhāgā might be identical with river Chambal.

[2] Hiralal, *Cat. Mss.*, Introduction, p. 22. The work has also been published by M.D.J.G., Bombay and Bharatiya Gyanpith, Varanasi.

logy consisting of 33 gurus covering a period of about 627 years, thus giving an average of 19 years for each guru. This is the first well-preserved and authentic genealogy so far discovered in literature. And he gives the dynastic chronology for the first one thousand years beginning with Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* and ending with the end of the Kalki, which is in agreement with other Digambara sources relating to that tradition. The author mentions a number of eminent Jaina scholars of the past like Samantabhadra, Siddhasena, Devanandi, Vajrasūri, Akalaṅka, Mahāsena, Raviṣeṇa, Jaṭācārya, Śānta Viśeṣavādī, Kumārasena, Vīrasena guru and Jinasena Svāmi, and describes the great event of Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* with place, time, date and an account of the celebrations held on that occasion. This is the earliest literary evidence specifically telling the origin of the Dīpāvalī festival and its expressly Jaina significance. At the end of the work the author tells us that he began his *Harivaṁśa* in the Śrī Pārśva temple of the Nannarāja Vasati in Vardhamānapur and later on, proceeding to Dostaṭikā, completed the work in the Śāntinātha temple of that place in S.E. 705 (or A.D. 783), and that at that time towards the north lay the dominions of Indrāyudha; towards the south, those of Śrīvallabha, the son of king Kṛṣṇa; in the east ruled the lord of Avanti and in the west King Vatsarāja, while the ruler of the Sauramaṇḍala was Jaya Vīra Varāha.[1]

---

[1] शाकेष्वब्द शतेषु सप्तसुदिश पञ्चोत्तरेषूत्तरा,
पातीन्द्रायुधनाम्नि कृष्णनृपजे श्रीवल्लभे दक्षिणाम्।
पूर्वां श्रीमदवन्तिभूभृतिनृपे वत्सादिराजेऽपरां,
सौराणामधिमंडल जययुतेवीरेवराहेऽवति ।।५२।।
कल्याणैः परिवर्धमान विपुलश्रीवर्धमानपुरे,
श्री पार्श्वालिय नन्नराजवसतौ पर्याप्तशेष.पुरा।

The importance of the last mentioned piece of information has long been admitted by scholars. Attempts to identify the kings and places mentioned therein have been made, but they have not proved quite satisfactory.[1] In fact, unless the place of the completion of *Harivaṁśa* is correctly identified it is difficult to identify beyond doubt the kings and particularly the boundaries of their respective domains. Of all the identifications, the one suggested by Dr. Hiralal Jain appears to be the most appropriate.[2] He identifies Vardhamānapur with Badnāvara, a small town in the former Dhara state, situated some 40 miles west of Ujjain and Dostaṭikā with village Dostariyā, 12 miles west of Badnāvara. The latter seems to have derived its name from its being situated between two rivers, the Māhī and the Bagodī, on the boundary line of Gujarat and Malwa. That the old name of Badnāvara was Vardhamānapur or Vardhanapura is proved by some Jaina inscriptions found in its vicinity.[3] With this place as centre Indrāyudha ruled in the north from Kannauj to the boundaries of Malwa; the dominions of Malwa thus lay to the east of Vardhamānapur. To its west lay the dominions of Gurjara king Vatsarāja of Bhinnamāla (with his capital probably at Jābālipur), stretching over

---

पश्चाद्दोस्तटिका प्रजा प्रजनित प्राज्यार्चनावर्चने,
शान्ते शान्तगृहे जिनस्य रचितावशो हरिणामयम् ॥५३॥

—*Harivamśa*, Sarga 60.

[1] See Smith, *Early History of India*; Bhandarkar, *Early History of the Deccan*; Vaidya, *Mediaeval Hindu India*, Vol. II, pp. 101-02 (Poona, 1944); Ojha, *History of Rajputana*; Dodwell, *Cambridge Shorter History of India*, p. 131; Altekar, *RTT*, p. 55 f.n. 21; etc.

[2] See *JSB*, XII. 2, pp. 9-17. Others have identified this place with Vadhavāna in Saurashtra.

[3] ibid.

the whole of Mārwar and Gujarat.[1] In the south Dhruva Dhārāvarṣa Śrīvallabha (A.D. 779-93), the son of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I, was the sole monarch. Sauramaṇḍala[2] or Saurashtra was ruled by Jaya Vīra Varāha. The facts of contemporary history seem to corroborate this political division in the last quarter of the 8th century A.D.

VIDYANANDI, a great logician, commentator and exponent of Akalaṅka's school, has been styled as the master of Syādvāda (Syādvāda-vidyāpati). He is the author of a number of important philosophico-logical works such as the *Vidyānandamahodaya*, *Ślokavārttika*, *Aṣṭasahasrī*, *Yuktyānuśāsana-alaṁkāra*, *Āpta-parīkṣā*, *Pramāṇa-parīkṣā*, *Satyaśāsana-parīkṣā*, *Pātraparīkṣā* and *Śrīpura-Pārśvanātha-stotra*.[3] The author gives but little information about himself directly, yet his works contain much valuable material which helps us to fix his own date as well as the times of a number of other Jaina, Brahmanical and Buddhist philosophers and several contemporary kings especially of the Western Gaṅga dynasty. Thus, being a commentator and follower of Akalaṅka (*c.* A.D. 625-75), Vidyānandi must have lived sometime after A.D. 700. On the other hand, being himself mentioned by Vādirāja (A.D. 1025), Prabhācandra (A.D. 980-1065) and Māṇikyanandi (*c.* A.D. 950-1000), he cannot be placed much beyond A.D. 900.[4]

---

[1] This is also known from Udyotana Sūri's statement made in his *Kuvalayamālā* referred to above.

[2] Jinasena is unique in giving the derivation of this country from the term 'sun worshippers' and not from Surāṣṭra as is generally done.

[3] See S. C. Vidyabhusana, *A History of Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*; *Āpta-parīkṣā*, introd.; *JSB*, XX. 1, pp. 1-13; *Anekānta*, V. 8-9, pp. 275-80.

[4] See *Anekānta*, VIII. 8-9, p. 349.

Among non-Jaina philosophers Vidyānandi criticises and refutes the views of not only Bhartṛhari, Udyotakara, Kumārila, Prabhākara and Vyomaśiva, all of whom belong to the 7th century, but also of Prajñākara, Maṇḍana Miśra, Bhaṭṭajayanta and Sureśvara, who belong to the 8th century.[1] He, however, mentions no scholar of the 9th century.

Jaina writers like Jinasena Punnāṭa, Jinasena of the Senagaṇa, Haribhadra, Udyotana and Anantavīrya, all of whom belong to *circa* A.D. 750-850, neither mention him nor are mentioned by him. Hence modern scholars have generally assigned him to some or the other part of this one-hundred-year period.[2]

In his *Aṣṭasahasrī*, Vidyānandi has admitted that in writing this work he was greatly helped by the advice of Kumārasena.[3] And this guru finds mention in the *Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783).[4]

In the colophons of four of his works, Vidyānandi alludes to a contemporary king named Satyavākya, and in one of his other works to Śivamāra, in another to Mārasiṁha and in yet another to probably Śrīpuruṣa.[5] These names clearly indicate the Western Gaṅga dynasty of Talkad, which produced four Satyavākyas, viz., those of A.D. 815-50, A.D. 870-907, A.D. 920 and A.D. 977,

---

[1] See *Anekānta*, X. 3, pp. 91-93; *JSB*, XX. 1, pp. 1-13.

[2] Thus Mrs. C. Duff places him in A.D. 810 (*Chronology of India*); Vidyabhusana in A.D. 750 (op. cit.); K. B. Pathak in A.D. 750 (*ABORI*, XII); S. C. Ghosala in A.D. 838 (*SBJ*, XI, Introduction); and so on.

[3] शश्वद्भीष्ट सहस्री कुमार सेनोक्ति वर्धमानार्था. . . .
—Colophon, v. 3.

[4] गुरोः कुमारसेनस्य विचरत्यजितात्मकम्. . . .
—*Harivaṁśa*, I. 38.

[5] See the author's article on Vidyānandi in *Anekānta*, X. 7-8, pp. 274-288.

respectively. Hence the Satyavākya alluded to must have been Rācamalla Satyavākya I (A.D. 815-50), the son of Vijayāditya and a nephew of Śivamāra II. In his *Aṣṭasahasrī*, which is definitely an earlier composition than these works, with the name of Satyavākya he alludes to Mārasiṁha, also to Dhruva Dhārāvarṣa and to the recent demise of Svāmi Vīrasena, which facts would assign this work to about A.D. 791-92.[1] In a yet earlier work, viz., the *Ślokavārttika*, he alludes to Śivamāra who ruled from A.D. 777 to 784 when he fell out with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and passed the rest of his life virtually as their prisoner. In his absence his son Mārasiṁha ruled at Talkad, at least from A.D. 785 to 800.[2] The *Śrīpura-Pārśvanātha-stotra* seems to have been written in A.D. 776 in the reign of Śrīpuruṣa (A.D. 726-77) and probably on the occasion when that king in that year gave a grant to that very Pārśvanātha temple of Śrīpura and to some gurus of the Nandi Saṁgha of the lineage of Kumāranandi and Vimalacandra referred to before.[3] Probably he also belonged to the same line and was a grand-disciple of Vimalacandra and a colleague or a disciple of Parvādimalla. Vidyānandi seems to have made this Śrīpura his headquarters particularly because it was close to Śṛṅgeri where Śaṅkara and his disciple Sureśvara were just then establishing their headquarters. But it appears that the wrath of Śaṅkara and his organisation was directed against the Buddhists of the Kāñcī region alone and not against the Jainas who, thanks to the remarkable personality, high scholarship and peaceful nature of their leader Vidyānandi

---

[1] ibid.
[2] ibid.
[3] See *IA*, II, pp. 155-61; Rice, *My. & Cg.*, p. 39; *EC*, IV, Ng. 85, pp. 135-36.

(*circa* A.D. 775-825), maintained cordial relations with the Vedantist leaders.

SVAYAMBHU is regarded as the greatest poet of the Apabhraṁśa language. He is known to have written the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Harivaṁśa*, *Nāgakumāracarita*, *Svayambhūchanda* (on prosody) and an Apabhraṁśa grammar. His works have been recently discovered and they have attracted the notice of scholars and elicited their appreciation.[1] Svayambhū was the son of poet Mauradeva and Padminī and seems to have originally belonged to Kannauj and to have been patronized by the royal banker Dhanañjaya. It appears that when in about A.D. 780 Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruva went to the help of Indrāyudha of Kannauj against Dharmapāla of Bengal, he, on his return, brought with him the banker Dhanañjaya along with his protegè Svayambhū. It is at the end of the 20th chapter of his *Rāmāyaṇa* that we find the name of King Dhruva mentioned for the first time.[2] Thence onwards wherever he gives the name of his patron he gives it as Dhavalaiya instead of Dhanañjaya. Dhavalaiya seems to have been a popular title of Dhruvarāja Nirupama (A.D. 779-93). Svayambhū was a householder, had two wives and several children. But after his arrival in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital he seems to have come in close contact with Svāmi Vīrasena of Vāṭanagara and probably soon after the death of the latter, he himself seems to have left home and turned a monk under

[1] See *Hindī Kāvyadhārā* (Allahabad, 1945), pp. 22-27, 100; *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, 1940, March-Aug., 2-3; *Anekānta*, V. 8-9, pp. 297-309; *JSI*, p. 370; *Candābāi Volume*, pp. 410-14; *JBBRAS*, II, 1935; *Journal of Nagpur University*, Dec. 1935. Even Gosvāmi Tulasīdāsa in his *Rāmacaritamānasa* seems to admit the debt of Svayambhū and his *Rāmāyaṇa*. (See *Sarasvatī*, Sep. 1955, p. 156).

[2] धुवराय धवलइय भुअप्पणत्तिणत्ती सुयाणु पाढेण।
णामेण सामिअब्बा सयंभुघरिणी महासत्ता॥

the name of Śrīpāla. This is why he left all his works in the form of their first rough drafts which were revised, edited and here and there elaborated by his able son Tribhuvana Svayambhū who also seems to have been a great poet of Apabhraṁśa. Jinasena Svāmi completed the *Jayadhavala* of Vīrasena in A.D. 837 and he tells us that in this work he was greatly helped by an old and veteran scholar, Śrīpāla[1], who seems to have been none else than poet Svayambhū turned an ascetic. The works of Svayambhū, besides being valuable for linguistic studies, literary merit and cultural information, mention the names of a number of Jaina and non-Jaina poets of Sanskrit, Prākrt and Apabhraṁśa, none of whom belongs to later than the early part of the 8th century A.D. For example, he alludes to the Five Epics (*Raghuvaṁśa*, *Kumārasambhava*, *Śiśupālavadha*, *Kirātārjunīya* and *Bhaṭṭikāvya*), to Bharata and his *Nāṭyaśāstra*, to Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin and their works on poetics, to the verbosity of Vyāsa and Bāṇa, to Raviṣeṇa and his *Rāmakathā* and to the poetic excellence of Śrīharṣa. The Śrīharsa alluded to is obviously the emperor Harṣa from whose *Nāgānanda* a verse has also been quoted, and not Śrīharṣa, the author of *Naiṣadha*, who belonged to later times. On the other hand, Puṣpadanta (A.D. 959) who is another great Apabhraṁśa poet, mentions Svayambhū and his works with great respect.

---

[1] 'टीका श्रीजयचिन्हतोरुधवला सूत्रार्थसद्योतिनी स्थेयादा रविचन्द्रमुज्ज्वल तपः सत्कीर्त्तंय श्रीपाल सपालितः'—*Jayadhavala*, I, Introduction, pp. 43-44. Jinasena also mentions Śrīpāla elsewhere in his *Ādipurāṇa*, with respect. That Śrīpāla was one of the several names of Svayambhū is evident from his works. His another name was Dhavala, which is also significant.

JINASENA SVAMI of the Sena Saṁgha, who was the favourite disciple and pontifical successor of Svāmi Vīrasena (*c.* A.D. 710-90) and is the author of the *Jayadhavala* (completed in A.D. 837), *Pārśvābhyudaya-kāvya* and *Ādipurāṇa* or *Mahāpurāṇa* (incomplete), has often been confused with Jinasena Sūri Punnāṭa, the author of the *Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783) as also with Jinasena I, the author of the *Vardhamānapurāṇa*, who finds mention in the *Harivaṁśa*.[1] The present Jinasena is regarded as one of the greatest Jaina gurus of that period. He seems to have been adopted by Vīrasena as a mere child and to have received an excellent education at the hands of that great guru. The fact that he completed the *Jayadhavala* left incomplete by Vīrasena some 47 years after the death of the latter shows that he must have been too young and immature to undertake that tremendous task soon after his guru's death. He must have taken some 20 or 25 years at least to complete the 60,000 *ślokas* of the highly learned commentary. From Jinasena's own works, from the statements of several other contemporary writers and from a generally accepted tradition it appears that Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I Nṛpatuṅga (A.D. 815-77) was a devotee of this saint and owned him as his spiritual preceptor.[2] *Ādipurāṇa* is his last work which death prevented him from completing. But the 10,380 verses which he has left and which do not complete even the first of the 24 parts of that great work as he had planned to write it, speak of his mastery of the Sanskrit language, his remarkable poetic talents, his historic sense and his

[1] See *Anekānta*, X. 7-8, p. 276 f.n.

[2] See *MJ*, p. 38; *RTT*, p. 88; *Kaviacarite*, I, p. 17; *Bombay Gazetteer*, I. pt. 2, p. 200; *IA*, XII, pp. 216-17; *Anekānta*, V. 5, pp. 183-87.

knowledge of political geography, practical politics and other varied subjects. In the colophon of the *Jayadhavala*, besides other useful information, he gives the date of its completion.[1] He is certainly one of the greatest Purāṇakāras, and should be assigned to *circa* A.D. 770-850.

GUNABHADRA, Jinasena's chief disciple and successor, completed the *Mahāpurāṇa* but apparently on a much smaller scale[2] than the one originally proposed by Jinasena. He seems to have been patronised by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II Akālavarṣa (A.D. 877-914). We do not know the exact date of the completion of the *Mahāpurāṇa* by Gunabhadra. The concluding portion of the colophon at its end indicates that in Śaka year 820 (or A.D. 898), Lokasena, a disciple of Gunabhadra and a protegè of Lokāditya, the viceroy of Baṅkāpur in the country of Vanavāsa, installed this great *Mahāpurāṇa* for public worship and recitation.[3]

UGRADITYA is the author of *Kalyāṇakāraku*, a complete and original treatise on the science of medicine, written in Sanskrit verse and divided into two parts and 25 chapters with an appendix on the subject of fatal symptoms and yet another extra chapter at the end dealing with the usclessness of meat diet.[4] The

---

[1] 'इति श्री वीरसेनीया टीका सूत्रार्थ दर्शिनी, वाटग्रामपुरे श्रीमदगुर्जरार्यानुपालिते, फाल्गुनि मासिपूर्वाहणेदशम्या शुक्लपक्षके, प्रवर्धमान पूजाया नन्दीश्वर महोत्सवे ..एकान्नषष्टि समधिकसप्तशताब्देषु (७५९) शकनरेन्द्रस्य समतीतेषु समाप्ता जयधवलाप्राभृत व्याख्या।' —*Jayadhavala*, colophon.

[2] That is about 9,000 verses in all. *Ātmānuśāsana* and *Jinadatta-carita* are the two other works of Gunabhadra.

[3] Of this important colophon of the *Uttarapurāṇa* of Guṇabhadra, the first 27 verses seem to have been composed by himself and the remaining 15 by his disciple Lokasena.

[4] See *MAR*, 1922, p. 23; *Praśasti-saṁgraha* (Arrah), pp. 56-57; *Kalyāṇakāraka*, pub. in Sakhiram Nemichandra Series No. 129, Solapur, with valuable introductions.

author deals with the philosophy of medicine, sketches briefly its traditional history and traces its origin to the *Prāṇavāya-pūrva* of the original canon. Yet in the treatment of the science proper he is singularly free from any touch of sectarianism and unlike some other Jaina writers on the subject, even avoids using Jaina technology. He seems to be well acquainted with most of the earlier literature, both Jaina and non-Jaina on the subject and refers to or quotes from many renowned authors.[1] But for him we would not have known that many of the otherwise well-known Jaina gurus of our period were also highly proficient in medicine.[2] In the *puṣpikās* found at the end of every chapter, in the author's *praśasti* at the end of the book, in the Hitāhita-adhyāya (the extra chapter) and in several other passages of the work, the author gives us bits of information which help us to fix his date and residence and the identity of his patrons. Thus we know that he was a pontiff of the Deśīgaṇa, Pustakagaccha, Pansogavalli-śākhā of the Mūla Saṁgha in the line of Kundakunda, and was reputed for his learning. One Lalitakīrti Ācārya was his colleague, and his guru was Śrīnandi in whose establishment at Mount Rāmagiri, Ugrāditya studied the science. 'By order of this guru Śrīnandi whose feet were worshipped by Srī Viṣṇurāja Parameśvara, Ugrāditya wrote his *Kalyāṇakāraka* for the good of mankind, on the beautiful hill of Rāmagiri which was adorned with many Jaina caves, temples and other objects of worship and was situated in the level plains of Veṅgī in the country of Trikaliṅga.' The discourse on the uselessness of meat diet contained

[1] ibid.

[2] Such as Samantabhadra, Pūjyapāda, Siddhasena, Pātrakesari and Daśarathaguru.

in the Hitāhita-adhyāya is stated by himself to have been delivered in the court of Srī Nṛpatuṅga Vallabha Mahārājādhirāja, where many learned men and doctors had assembled.[1]

The Rāmagiri in question seems to be identical with the hill of Rāmatīrtha in the modern Vishakhapatnam district of Andhra Pradesh.[2] In the inscriptions this place is named as Rāmakōṇḍ (Kōṇḍ=Giri or mount). The Viṣṇurāja Parameśvara appears to be none else than Viṣṇuvardhana IV (A.D. 762-99), the Eastern Cālukya monarch of Veṅgī, and Nṛpatuṅga Vallabha is evidently the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I (A.D. 815-77). It appears that Ugrāditya had completed his work sometime in the last decade of the 8th century A.D., and about A.D. 630-40 he came to Mānyakheṭa and delivered his discourse in the presence of that lover of learning, the great Rāstrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I. That discourse too was incorporated as an extra chapter in his work. Ugrāditya thus seems to have lived in *circa* A.D. 770-840.

MAHAVIRACARYA, the author of *Gaṇitasāra-saṁgraha*, a valuable and complete treatise on mathematics, appears to have belonged to the later part of Amoghavarṣa's reign.[3] In the colophon of his work he states that this great king was a follower of Syādvāda, was

---

[1] See *Praśasti-saṁgraha*, op. cit. Also note the words—'वैद्यशास्त्रेषुमासनिराकरणार्थमुग्रादित्याचार्यैर्नृपतुगवल्लभेन्द्र सभायामुद्घोषितप्रकरणम', found at the end of the Hitāhita-adhyāya.

[2] cf. the author's 'Ramgiri of Ugrāditya's Kalyānakāraka' in the *PIHC*, Nagpur Session, 1950, pp. 127-33. In this paper the identifications attempted by other scholars have been proved to be wrong.

[3] The work has been edited, translated and published by Prof. M. Rangacharya, Madras, 1914.

devoted to the practice of religion and was of a retiring nature.[1] The author seems to have belonged to *circa* A.D. 850-80.

SAKTAYANA PALYAKIRTI, a great grammarian, author of *Śabdānuśāsana* along with its commentary known as the *Amoghavṛtti* named as such in honour of his patron Amoghavarṣa I, belonged to the Yāpanīya Saṁgha.[2] In his commentary of one of his own Sūtras he seems to have alluded to 'Amoghavarsa's burning down his enemies[3],' which fact is corroborated by that king's Begumara plates which speak of how he crushed the rebel Māṇḍalikas of Gujarat in A.D. 867.[4] Hence the work seems to have been written in *c.* A.D. 870 and the author to have belonged to *circa* A.D. 850-75.

AMOGHAVARSA I NRIPATUNGA, the great Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor (A.D. 815-77) of Mānyakheta, was not only a peace-loving and religious-minded king who patronized art and learning but was also a reputed author. He is said to have written a fine didactic work named *Prāśnottara Ratnamālā* in Sanskrit and a work on figures of speech named *Kavirājamārga* in Kannada.[5] He was highly tolerant towards all creeds but his special leanings towards Jainism find unmistakable expression in contemporary writings. At least towards the end of his

[1] See Fleet, *Bombay Gazetteer*, I. Pt. 2, pp. 200-01; K. B. Pathak, *Kavirājamārga*, Introduction; *Anekānta*, III. 11, p. 645; *JA*, XV. 1, p. 32; XV. 2, p. 46.

[2] See *ABORI*, I, 1918-20, pp. 7-12; *IA*, XLIII. 1914, pp. 205-12; XLIV, 1915, pp. 275-79; XLV, 1916, pp. 25-27; *JSI*, pp. 150 ff.; *Anekānta*, III. 1, p. 159.

[3] The sūtra is ख्याते दृश्ये (IV. III. 207) and its *vṛtti* says—अदहदमोघ वर्षोऽरातीन्

[4] *IA*, XLIII, 1914, pp. 205-12; also see insc. of A.D. 910 (*EI*, I, p. 54).

[5] Both edited and published by Dr. K. B. Pathak, Bombay; vide., introduction to these works; also Altekar, *RTT*; Bhandarkar, *Early History of the Deccan*, p. 95; *Anekānta*, I. 8-9-10, pp. 471-72.

reign he seems to have led the life of a pious Jaina recluse.[1]

And with the close of this king's reign in the last quarter of the 9th century A.D. ends the thousand-year period covered by the present work as also the most glorious period of the literary history of Jainism. Only a few of the most important authors of the period have been briefly discussed. There are many others. An examination of their works and facts about their lives may reveal many an interesting historical datum.

[1] ibid., also see *JSB*, IX. 1; *Anekānta*, V. 5, pp. 183-87.

CHAPTER XI

THE LATER POLITICAL, HISTORICAL AND STORY LITERATURE

JAINISM, in our period, far from being a bundle of metaphysical beliefs, was a faith that added in a large measure to the material prosperity of the land. The Jaina leaders ceased to be merely exponents of dogmas and turned themselves into leaders of people and guides of princes. Some of them actually adopted political life and acted as instructors in politics to kings and feudal chiefs. Several kingdoms like the Gaṅga, the Sāntara, the Chāvaḍā and the Hoysala even claimed to have been created by or at the instance of Jaina gurus. It is, therefore, not surprising that they made valuable contribution to political thought as it obtained in the post-Gupta period.

In the times of Mahāvīra and the Buddha there were a number of republican states and democratic federations in many parts of India. But by the beginning of the Christian era the age of republics was over. A succession of monarchical imperialistic states left no room for such institutions. Kauṭilya, the master politician had established, in the 4th century B.C., the despotic monarchical type with unlimited autocratic powers as the ideal State. The doctrine of divine right of kings and the law of primogeniture were bound to be the inevitable associates of such a monarchy. All the later Indian political thinkers, law-givers and *Purāṇa* writers followed the footsteps of the master and tried their best to maintain the unlimited autocracy of the king and the sanctity of his position. They laboured more to

enumerate his powers and to extol his rank than to detail his duties and responsibilities in relation to his subjects. In their opinion his only important duty was to act as a protector of cow and Brahmins. He might be capable or incapable, just or unjust, benevolent or tyrannical, thrifty or extravagant, a good man or a licentious brute, learned or foolish and even mad, but he had absolute power over his subjects and they had to submit to his will. No one could interfere with his position as a king. The ministers and state officers were his own paid servants and had to be subservient to him. They were only to execute his orders and give him help and advice as and when he willed so.

The evils of such an absolute despotism were bound to appear, as they have done in all ages and countries. Indian political thinkers also did not fail to take notice of them. If not a total overhaul of the system, at least a reform or a new outlook was urgently required. And the necessity was supplied, not by the Brahmanic thinkers, Smrti-kāras or *Purāṇa* writers, nor by the Buddhists, but by the Jaina scholars.

In point of extent the Buddhist political literature is surpassed by the Jaina. The method and tenets of the science of government evolved by the Brahmins in the long course of centuries were adopted by the Jainas. Their works which contain political reflections belong to the age which saw the rise of Brahmanical *Smṛtis* and *Purāṇas*. In the hands of Jaina authors the current political theories of the origin and character of government received a fresh turn of elaboration which merits attention. The different Jaina *Caritra* and *Purāṇa* writers casually touched the subject in their works. One of the finest presentations of the theory occurs in the *Ādipurāṇa* of Jinasena (*c*. A.D. 837) who was

the religious preceptor of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Emperor Amoghavarṣa I (A.D. 815-877). Jaṭila in his *Varāṅga-caritra* (*c.* A.D. 700), Vīranandi in his *Candraprabhu-Carita, sarga* 5 (A.D. 978) and Hariścandra in his *Dharma-śarmābhyudaya, sarga* 18 (*c.* A.D. 1000), also give brief but interesting discourses on practical politics.

In the tenth century, Somadeva Sūri summed up the current political wisdom in a remarkable book called the *Nītivākyāmṛta*[1] (Nectar of Political Sayings). In spite of the Sūtra form, the very acme of precision, Somadeva has managed to combine extreme brevity with considerable perspicuity of expression. In his *Yaśastilaka-campū*[2], he expounds the orthodox tenets of Jainism in a masterly fashion. But as a political thinker he follows the universal tradition. He mentions the author of the *Arthaśāstra* more than once. He often borrows the thoughts and sometimes the very expression of the master. Frequently he taps other sources and refers to Manu, Vasiṣtha, Bhāguri, Bhīṣma, Bharadvāja, Viśālākṣa and other political writers, but his mastery of literary craftsmanship enables him to weave his various collections into a fine harmonious whole which has all the appearances of unity and originality. And it must be admitted that Somadeva does often alight on a thought that is new and generally gives a striking form to what has been crudely put long before.

---

[1] The text of *Nītivākyāmṛta* with a Sanskrit commentary by Haribala has been published in the M.D.J.G. series, Bombay. Somadeva Sūri flourished in the reign of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III. He composed his *Yaśastilaka-campū* in A.D. 959 at the capital of Baddiga, the eldest son of Cālukya Arikesari. He was probably patronised by the later Cālukyas of Badāmī. He belonged to the Deva Saṁgha and was noted as a great dialectician, a poet of considerable merit and a master of Jaina doctrine and tradition.

[2] Published in the Kāvyamālā. It is the first great example of the Campū type of literature.

In fact, in many cases he seems to have revolutionised the current political thought, and the freshness of outlook that he has, places him in a class by himself.

The work opens with an imprecatory verse[1] which is capable of more than one interpretation, but which apparently refers to the author's teacher. It is significant that the first chapter which is devoted to religion and morality, should dispense with the usual divine commemoration, and start with homage to a worldly master. It testifies to the process of secularisation that had gone so far in the political science.

The first Sūtra[2] offers a salutation to the State, because in it one finds the realisation of his religious, economic and sensual activities. State is the source of religion and morality, of wealth and success, of enjoyment and happiness. Would it not delight the heart of a Hegelian to find that about a thousand years before the German idealist, the Indian writer extolled the State as the *summum bonum* of human life?

The definition of religion is also so liberal that it can admit equally of an ecclesiastical as well as secularist interpretation. It is the door to success and welfare, whether of this world or of the next, we are not told, but probably refers to that of both.[3] And in whichever deity one places his faith it is his God.[4] The State must pursue a policy of perfect religious toleration. All should be allowed to pursue their respective faiths peacefully. The best conduct (for all) is the one which is based on the principle of equality towards all beings.[5]

---

[1] *Nītivākyāmrta*, p. 1.
[2] ibid., p. 7.—अथधर्मार्थकामफलाय राज्यायनमः।
[3] ibid., p. 8—यतोऽभ्युदय नि श्रेयस सिद्धि स धर्म·।
[4] ibid., p. 86—यो यस्य देवस्य भवेच्छ्रद्धावान सत देव प्रतिष्ठापयेत्।
[5] ibid., p. 9—सर्वं सत्वेषु हि समता सर्वाचरणाना परमाचरणे।

A person is advised to have a right sense of proportion in following his religious, economic and sensual pursuits. He is not to overdo any one of them, particularly the last one, because one who neglects religious and money-making activities, and indiscriminately indulges in sensual pleasures, can hardly be ever happy.[1]

The foremost duty of the State is the punishment of the wicked and the protection of the law-abiding.[2] He is not a king who fails to protect his subjects.[3] It is in exchange for this protection that he gets a sixth of the fruit of his subjects' labour. Even the ascetics are not immune from this lawful taxation.[4] Moreover, this protection is not to be understood in a negative sense only, it has also a positive side. The State must not be satisfied with protecting people from outside invasions and internal wrong-doers. It must at the same time devise all necessary means to promote prosperity. And the foundation of all prosperity is agriculture, although trade and industry are not to be ignored.[5] The existence of the State is based on regular inheritance together with valour and prowess of the ruler. The State must not fail in its functions, duties and responsibilities, and must prove to be a progressive State.[6]

The king, being the head of the State, must be quite fit to bear the responsible burden. A real king must be the repository of all the merits that are extolled by wise men.[7] And one who has knowledge and

[1] ibid., p. 33—सम वा त्रिवर्ग सर्वत-धर्मार्थं विरोधेन कामसेवेत ततः सुखीस्यात्।

[2] ibid., p. 42.

[3] ibid., p. 87—स कि राजा यो न रक्षति प्रजा ।

[4] ibid., p. 88.

[5] ibid., pp. 88-90, 93-95, etc.

[6] ibid., p. 52—राज्यस्य मूल क्रमो विक्रमश्च, etc.

[7] ibid., pp. 56-57.

intelligence combined with real humility is really wise.[1] Then, we are told in all seriousness that the real brute on earth is an ignoramus.[2] Knowledge is the prime requisite in public affairs. Anarchy is better than the rule of an ignoramus.[3] It will be remembered that the Buddhist works, Kauṭilya, the epics, the *Purāṇas* and the law-givers alike had descanted on anarchy as the most terrible of all contingencies. Somadeva departs from tradition and prefers absence of government to uninstructed rule, for, he explains, no calamity is so serious, so ruinous as a perverse king.[4] Misrule is not to be tolerated in any case. He denounces oppression, advocates justice and kindness and warns the State against popular indignation which should never be aroused.[5] On the same principle a prince, however well born, should not be installed as heir-apparent unless he is otherwise qualified for the great trust.[6] Thus for the sake of good government even the long established law of primogeniture was to be set aside. This was another revolutionary idea.

According to him taxation must be adjusted to the resources of the people, and government expenditure must not exceed its income. Merit or fitness should be the only criterion for office.[7] But no foreigners should be employed in the services, since they cannot be expected to be patriotic to the country and the State. He says, love of one's own country is the highest and

---

[1] ibid , p. 54
[2] ibid , p. 56.
[3] ibid , p. 56—वरमराजकम् भुवन न तु मूर्खो राजा।
[4] ibid., p. 57.
[5] ibid., p. 157.
[6] ibid., p. 56.
[7] ibid., pp. 185-90.

the most tenacious of all prejudices.[1] This shows Somadeva is also not ignorant of patriotic nationalism. He is also against the military control of policy.[2]

In his book, he deals at length with the requisite education and discipline of the princes, the position and functions of monarchy and the number, importance, qualifications and duties of the ministers. He has something substantial to say on practically all the elements of the State—the officers (civil and military), justice, oath, treasury, taxation, army, allies, foreign policy, ambassadors, deliberations and negotiations, criminal intelligence and military espionage, defence, agriculture, trade, industry and commerce, the country and the people. Besides, the work contains many precepts which relate to mundane as well as spiritual affairs and a number of maxims, moral and worldly, applicable to various walks of life. Even marriage and other miscellaneous social matters are not left untouched.

One of the most remarkable features of *Nītivākyāmṛta* is its elimination of the caste privilege. Somadeva recognises caste and wants everyone generally to adhere to his hereditary occupation. In certain passages he even seems to concede a particular sanctity to the Brahmins, but he would treat all as equal before the law, irrespective of caste, creed, calling or rank. He has certainly a higher conception of society and the State than the Brahmanic law-givers had. There is no doubt that he revolutionised the then political theory and must have, to a great extent, influenced its practice in the contemporary world.

Somadeva Sūri's fame as a political thinker will

---

[1] ibid., pp. 102-04.
[2] ibid., pp. 136-37.

always rest on the *Nītivākyāmṛta*, but many of his ideas are to be found in his other work, *Yaśastilaka-campū*. In its third *Āśvāsa* (or chapter), he gives a description of king Yaśodhara and touches on a variety of political topics. His diction and lucidity are admirable, but practically all he has to say here on government has been incorporated in the *Nītivākyāmṛta*. Somadeva is believed to have written at least three other works which have not yet been discovered, but of them the one called *Trivarga-Mahendra-Mātali-sañjalpa* appears from its name to have touched politics; it purports to be a dialogue between Indra and his charioteer Mātali on *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma*.

It may be noted that Jinasena and other earlier Jaina political writers must have paved the way for Somadeva and the views he expressed should be taken as representing the political thought in the several centuries preceding him. Among other later works on the subject, the *Gadyacintāmaṇi* of Vādībhasiṁha (11th century) and the *Arhannīti* of Hemacandra (12th century) may be mentioned.

HISTORICAL LITERATURE

It would be too much to expect regular history books of the modern scientific type from the authors of those times. But the reproach to India's spiritual attitude, viz., that it is too much turned away from the world of facts to the sphere of thought to exhibit historical sense, has long been shown to have been wrong. As Dr. Walthur Schubring has observed, "It was based upon some misunderstandings which naturally arose when India was measured with the scale found in China, Babylonia and Egypt. Her sources of history often flow not so plainly by far as those of

other empires of the past, but there are some where no historian would have the right to deny the existence of historical exactness. It is specially Jaina authors who develop this praiseworthy quality. History cannot be told more exactly than has been done, for instance, in the Jaina *Guruvāvalis* and *Paṭṭāvalis*. The care with which the history of the primitive Jaina community is written by Hemacandra and other later authors is highly meritorious. Of course, the *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* (and such other Jaina works) contains much legendary bywork, but is it not the same thing in the west where nobody would think of not taking notice of our own mediaeval chronicles where history and legend so often intermingle? Seen on the whole, Jainism exhibits, if I am allowed to say so, a sober view of the world, a view which would bring together with it its clear insight into the predestined course of events. A religion which is based upon the view that periods of increase and of decrease follow each other in never ceasing turnings cannot, in its historical documents, but describe the respective state of things with a calm mind."[1] And Prof. Buhler, writing to Noldke in 1877 on the contribution of the ancient Hindus in the field of historical literature said, "You are a little behind the age with your notion that Indians have no historical literature. In the last twenty years five fairly voluminous works have been discovered, emanating from authors contemporary with the events which they describe. Four of them I have discovered myself. I am on the track of more than a dozen more."[2] There is no doubt that the works referred to by Prof. Bühler were the

[1] Text of Dr. Schubring's lecture at Delhi, published in *Vīra*, V. 11-12, pp. 288-98 (1928).

[2] cf., *Modern Review*, Jan. 1955, pp. 68-69.

Jaina *Prabandhas* and histories. Among these, in search of which he was active, was the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga (A.D. 1305). Prof C.H. Tawney, the translator of this work, was so warm in its praise that in his words, it 'blunted the edge of reproach....that with the exception of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* there is to be found no work in Sanskrit literature meriting the title of history.'[1]

In the foregoing pages we have briefly surveyed the Jaina sources of history which are of a contemporary nature. But the bulk of Jaina historical literature was produced in the several centuries following the close of our period (i.e., *circa* A.D. 900). To deal with it categorically, let us first take the *Paṭṭāvalis* and *Guruvāvalis*. There are numerous such documents relating to the different saṁghas, gaṇas, gacchas, etc., of the Digambaras as well as the Śvetāmbaras. Most of these *Paṭṭāvalis* or pontifical genealogies-cum-chronicles, in their present form, belong to later mediaeval times (i.e., 15th-17th century A.D.). They are full of discrepancies, too, and are often not very reliable about early times. But there are some, such as the Prākrt *Paṭṭāvali* of the Nandi Saṁgha, the *Paṭṭāvali* of the Punnāta Saṁgha, the *Kalpasūtra Sthavirāvali* and the *Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvali*, which belong to A.D. 500-900 and are sufficiently reliable. A large number of these *Paṭṭāvalis* and *Guruvāvalis* have been taken notice of and are even published. Still there are many which are lying unnoticed in the different Bhaṇḍāras and in the old establishments of Digambara Bhaṭṭārakas and Śvetāmbara Yatis or Śrīpūjyas. A close and comparative examination of all these *Paṭṭāvalis* will not only

[1] ibid.

help in reconstructing a sufficiently correct history with a detailed and exact chronology of the Jaina Saṁgha through the ages, but is also likely to reveal many an interesting detail about the political history of the country during those centuries.

More or less similar to the *Paṭṭāvalis* are the *Rājāvalis*. Apart from the traditional dynastic chronologies for the thousand years following Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*, there are a number of *Rājāvalis* which are the political chronologies or brief chronicles of events relating particularly to the rulers of Delhi. They generally begin in the 7th or 8th century A.D. and end at the time of their respective compositions. Following are the more important of such *Rājāvalis* that have come to light so far : *Dilli kī Rājāvali*—anonymous, preserved in a *Guṭakā* manuscript at Mainpuri. It begins with the foundation of Delhi by Rānā Jāju in A.D. 772 (V.E. 829) and ends in A.D. 1489 in the reign of Sikandar Lodi.

Dilli kī Rājāvali—anonymous, preserved in a *Guṭakā* manuscript in the Jaina temple of Delhi. It begins with the foundation of the Tomara dynasty of Delhi, with Rānā Jāju as its founder in A.D. 782 (V.E. 839) and ends in A.D. 1628 with the accession of Shahjehan who is said to have succeeded his father Shah Salema.

Another *Rājāvali* of Delhi in Hindi verse, composed by poet Kisanadāsa starts with Anangapāla Tomara of Delhi in A.D. 852.

A *Vākā* or chronicle of events, by Ṛṣi Rūghā written in A.D. 1792, beginning with the foundation of Ujjayinī by Rāja Bhoja in A.D. 674 and ending in A.D. 1707 mentions the death of Aurangzeb and after him of Didarbaksha and the accession of Azamshah at

Delhi. It was discovered in a Kanpur Bhaṇḍāra a few years ago. A thorough search of the Jaina Bhaṇḍāras may bring to light many more such *Rājāvalis* and *Vākās*, several having been recently discovered in the Jaina Bhaṇḍāras of Rajasthan. They are likely to add many yet unknown events and dates to our mediaeval history.

Works like the *Darśanasāra* of Devasena (A.D. 933), the *Śrutāvatāras* of Indranandi (*c.* A.D. 950), Brahma Hema (*c.* A.D. 1175), Bibudha Śrīdhara (*c.* A.D. 1250) and Śubha Candra (A.D. 1530), the *Munivaṁśābhyudaya* of Cidānanda Kavi (A.D. 1680) and the *Therāvalis* of Hemacandra (A.D. 1172) and Merutunga (A.D. 1306) are true histories though they deal mainly with the early history of the Jaina Saṁgha and of its canonical literature.

Then there are the *Prabandhas*, *Khyātas* and historical accounts such as the *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* of Hemacandra (A.D. 1125-72), the *Prabhāvaka-carita* of Prabhācandrasūri (A.D. 1277), the *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi* with *Vicāraśreṇī* and *Therāvali* of Merutuṅga (A.D. 1305), the *Vividha Tīrtha-kalpa* of Jinaprabhasūri (A.D. 1332), the *Prabandhakośa* of Rājaśekharasūri (A.D. 1348),[1] the *Mūtā Naiṇsī-kī-khyāta* (A.D. 1659-65), a very authentic history of a number of Rajput tribes and kingdoms, the *Pūjya-pādacarite* by Padmappa and Candrappa (A.D. 1792), the *Kadamba-purāna*, the *Vijjaṇarāya-purāṇa*, the *Veṭṭi-vardhana-purāna*, and the *Himaśītala-kathe* or *Akalaṅka-carite*, all the four by Candrasāgara Varṇī (A.D. 1800-10), the *Bhuvanapradīpikā* of Rāmakṛṣṇa Śāstrī (A.D. 1808) and the *Rājāvalī-kathe* of Devacandra (A.D. 1834).

All these works are more or less of the same nature.

---

[1] Most of these *Prabandhas* have been published in S.J.G.

They purport to be religious-cum-political histories, begin their accounts early in the ancient period and bring them up to the dates of their respective completion. In general, the different chapters of all these works present a curious jumble of stories and a strange amalgam of fact and fiction. Historical facts and chronological data jostle with accounts of uncanny figures flying through the air or diving into the depths of the deep. They no doubt require patient study, and in spite of their shortcomings as scientific histories, a close, careful and comparative examination yields such a fruitful harvest of reliable facts, figures and dates which no other contemporaneous source does.

There are also some *Purāṇic-kāvyas* or *Caritras* which relate the life-stories of certain historical Jaina heroes of early times, such as the *Mahāvīracarita* of Asaga (A.D. 853), the *Jīvandhara-campū* of Vādībhasimha (*c*. A.D. 1050), the *Karakaṇḍu-cariu* of Kanakāmara (10th century), the *Sudarśana-carita* of Nayanandi (A.D. 1042), the *Jambu-carita* of Vīra (A.D. 1019) and of Sāgaradatta (A.D. 1020), the *Sreṇika-carita* of Jinadeva (A.D. 1444), the *Bhadrabāhu-carita* of Ratnanandi (*c*. A.D. 1600) and the *Bhadrabāhu-caritārtha-saṁgraha* of Jagannātha (A.D. 1650). These works are more of a legendary than historical character.

Works like the *Sāsanacaturviṁśatikā* of Madanakīrti (A.D. 1240), the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* of Jinaprabha (A.D. 1332), the *Daśabhaktyādisaṁgraha* of Vardhamāna (A.D. 1542), the *Satruñjaya-mahātmya* of Māheśvara (A.D. 1700) and the *Tīrthārcana-candrikā* of Guṇabhadra (A.D. 1750) describe and give the histories of old Jaina places of pilgrimage, and hence are valuable for ancient geography.

The colophons of a number of later works con-

tain useful historical information relating to older times. Many other works have sundry references and allusions, here and there, to old times and things.

A number of *Pratiṣṭhāpāṭhas* written from the 10th century onwards throw valuable light on the development of ritual, of temple architecture and of iconography relating to our period. Of these the works of Vasunandi (A.D. 1025) and Āśādhara (A.D. 1178-1243) are more important.

The numerous works on secular and scientific subjects written by the Jainas since A.D. 900, generally contain useful information which helps us to reconstruct the history and development of the various branches of Indian learning in earlier times. There is hardly any subject of secular learning which the mediaeval Jainas did not touch.

Lastly, numerous commentaries on important non-Jaina works were written by the Jainas. The commented works include the writings of most of the important classical poets and reputed works on poetics, prosody, lexicon and grammar, on astronomy, astrology and mathematics and on medicine. Many important ancient works have come down to us either through their Jaina commentaries, recensions or redactions, or because they were preserved in some Jaina Bhaṇḍāra.[1]

STORY LITERATURE

By far the most interesting branch of the Jaina literature is its *Kathā* or story literature. It is very extensive, varied and widespread over Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṁśa, Kannada, Tamil, Rajasthani, Gujarati and

[1] See also A. L. Basham, *The Wonder that was India* (London, 1954), p. 285—"We owe much to the Jaina monks' love of litera-

old Hindi. It includes parables and fables, folk-tales and moral anecdotes, tales of romance and adventure and of animal life and supernatural beings, satires and allegories, novels and dramas, even political and historical tales. There are detatched stories as well as interlinked series of stories. Some stories are small and some big. They are written in prose or in verse or in prose and verse mixed. The Jaina stories are purely indigenous and in a majority of cases quite original. There are no doubt adaptations from ancient works like the *Mahābhārata* or from folklore but they have been presented clothed in Jaina garb, e.g., the story of Nala-Damayantī. Unlike the Buddhist writer, the Jaina story-teller was free and unhampered by religious traditions. The Buddhist story invariably centres round the figure of a Bodhisattva; it was not so with the Jaina. Whatever the plot, the characters or the situation might be, the latter would go on telling his tale in a lively and realistic manner, but only towards the end he would philosophise or try to draw a moral or state that the story illustrated a particular doctrine. The stories are full of entertainment and have been very popular. Scholars like Tawney, Hertel, Bühler, Leumann, Tessitori, Jacobi and others, working in this field have traced the journey of many a Jaina tale to Europe via Arabia and Persia. Many such tales have been traced in the literatures of Tibet, Indonesia, Russia, Greece, Sicily, Italy and of the Jews.

---

ture. To copy a manuscript, even a secular one, was considered a work of great religious merit, and thus the old Jaina monasteries have preserved many rare and otherwise unknown texts, some of which have still to be published, and many of which are of non-Jaina origin."

Historical as the thinking of the modern mind is, it traces the history of a story or of its motives, of a thought or of an idea as far back as possible. "In this endeavour," observes Dr. Schubring, "Jaina literature gives a most valuable help. Innumerable threads connect Jaina Kathānakas with Brahmanical and Buddhist sources—no wonder for they have grown on the same soil and the same sun has ripened them. In this connection let me refer to some words of Prof. Leumann who, in the introduction to *Daśa-vaikālika-niryukti*, lays before us some of his results....and says that a study of Jaina literature will shed entirely new light on the history of Indian literature also, a light shining forth, as concerns Jaina stories from their intimate relations with the *Mahābhārata*, the *Harivaṃśa*, the *Jātakas*, the *Bṛhatkathā* and the *Pañcatantra*. From the area of Indian studies carried out under my own direction let me relate that new investigations about the *Rāmāyaṇa* as handed down to us on the Malayan Peninsula, make it clear to a surprising degree how vigorously the Jaina versions of the famous epic survive, in numerous motives, in the East, far from their native land."[1] In fact, it would not be too much to say that Jaina literature is intimately connected with India's culture as a whole. The mass of Jaina stories, culled as it is from daily practice, contains immense material for the knowledge of Indian life as lived in the past days.

The fondness of the Jainas for story-telling may be gleaned from the fact that some stories like that of Vikrama have as many as sixty different books written on it in different languages, while that of Srīpāla and Maināsundar has got fifty books written on it in one

[1] Schubring, op. cit.

language alone. There are several collections containing 100 to 200 stories, while there are even such collections which contain 360 stories so that the preacher might go on entertaining his audience for the whole year, daily with a fresh story. M.D. Desai in his *Gurjara Kavio* (Part I, Appendix) has drawn a list of 500 independent stories from ten collections.

The Jainas began writing story books from about the beginning of the Christian era. The *Painnas* (Miscellanea part of the canon) and the *Bhagavatī-ārādhanā* of Śivārya (Ist century A.D.) are believed to have been the ultimate sources for the bulk of Jaina stories. Jinasena (A.D 837) informs us that Kānabhikṣu was a very early writer of stories in Prākṛt. It is just possible that he might be identical with Kānabhūti whose stories in Bhūtabhāṣā (Prakrit) formed the basis of Guṇāḍhya's book. There had been several Jaina *Purāṇa* writers also in the early centuries. Pādalipta (3rd century A.D.) is also credited with the authorship of a *Taraṅgavatī-kathā*. From the 5th to 9th century A.D., on one side the *Ārādhanā* stories were developed in the several Prākṛt, Sanskrit and Kannada commentaries of that work and on the other the Purāṇic literature with numerous anecdotes and side-stories began rapidly to come into existence. Side by side, the stories embedded in the Svetāmbara *Āgama-sūtras* were developed in the *Niryuktis*, *Cūrṇis* and the *Bhāṣyas* on those texts. This triple literature formed the bedrock of and the source for the very extensive Jaina story literature that came to be produced from the 9th century onwards.

Jaina literature is classified into four *Anuyogas* or divisions—*Prathamānuyoga*, *Caraṇānuyoga*, *Karṇānuyoga* and *Dravyānuyoga*. The last three deal with ethics or rules of conduct, metaphysics and philosophy, respec-

15

tively. The first section deals with traditions, history and religious fiction. It is this section in which the story literature is included, that rather forms its bulk. It is so named because it is meant mostly for the uninitiated or beginners or the less intelligent common folk, male and female, young and old. The *Kathās* are divided into two classes—the *Dharmakathās* and the *Vikathās* (or bad stories). The latter are further divided into *Rājakathā* (stories of kings and states), *Corakathā* (stories of thieves and dacoits—crime stories), *Bhojanakathā* (stories of eating, drinking and other bodily enjoyments) and *Strīkathā* (stories of women, sensual and love stories). The *Dharmakathās* generally deal with the lives and pious acts of ancient heroes and heroines. Such stories generally cover several births and rebirths of the principal characters, starting from their lowest state of moral or worldly degradation, passing through crises, and eventually by following the path of religion attaining spiritual regeneration, temporal happiness and prowess and ending with eternal bliss and liberation. The *Vikathās*, too, were very often turned into *Dharmakathās* by adding a moral or a bit of philosophising at the end, even if it was only to indicate that a person reaped the fruit of what he had sown.

In the Jaina story literature first comes the *Ārādhanā* literature based on the *Bhagavatī* or *Mūla-ārādhanā* of Śivārya. Of the several Prākṛt, Sanskrit and Kannada commentaries of this work, most important and available are the *Vijayodayā-ṭīkā* of Aparājitasūri (A.D. 700), the *Ārādhanāsāra* of Devasena (A.D. 933), the *Ārādhanāsāra* of Amitagati (A.D. 993-1016) and the *Mūlārādhanāṭīkā* of Āśādhara (A.D. 1178-1243). The numerous allusions to past persons and events occurring in the original text have been developed into small stories

and illustrations by the commentators.

The Arādhanā-kathā literature is built upon these skeleton stories of the *Ārādhanā* and its *Ṭīkās*. A number of scholars culled these stories, developed them fully in their respective ways and styles and produced good collections of these stories, e.g., the Kannada *Vaḍḍārādhane* of Koṭyācārya (*c.* A.D. 800) containing 19 stories; the *Bṛhatkathākosa* of Hariṣeṇa (A.D. 932), which is the most important of these collections and contains more than a hundred stories; the *Ārādhanā-sata-kathā-prabandha* of Prabhācandra (A.D. 980-1065), a big collection in metrical Sanskrit, the *Ārādhanā-kathā-koṣa* of Śrīcandra (A.D. 1023-66) in Apabhraṁśa and the *Ārādhanā-kathākoṣa* of Brahma Nemidatta (A.D. 1518) in Sanskrit prose. A number of stories in these collections are of historical interest as well.

There are several other collections independent of the Arādhanā tradition. They are the *Puṇyāśrava-kathākoṣa* of Nāgarāja (A.D. 1331) in Kannada, the *Puṇyā-śrava-kathākoṣa* of Rāma Candra Mumukṣu (A.D. 1525) in Sanskrit; the *Samyaktvakaumudi* of Nāgadeva (A.D. 1400) in Sanskrit and of Pāyana Vrati (A.D. 1600) in Kannada, the *Dharmāmṛta* of Nayasena (A.D. 1125), etc.

Then there are the numerous *Vratakathās* developed and produced in mediaeval times. They centre around religious facts, festivals and sacred vows.

The Āgamic stories, apart from the *Niryuktis*, *Cūrṇis* and the *Bhāṣyas*, are found in some excellent collections like the *Kathāvalis* of Jineśvarasūri and Bhadreś-varasūri (both belonging to *circa* A.D. 1200). The *Prabandhas* mentioned under historical literature also contain many Āgamic stories.

The principal Jaina *Purāṇas* and a few *Caritras*

had been written prior to A.D. 900. But after A.D. 900 numerous *Purāṇas* and *Caritras* were written in different languages. These works, besides their respective principal themes, have numerous anecdotes, episodes and illustrative stories to tell us.

There is a large number of independent works on fiction as well, more important of which are the *Dhūrtākhyāna* and *Samarāicca-kahā* of Haribhadra (*c.* A.D. 775), the *Kuvalayamālā* of Udyotana (A.D. 778), the *Upamitibhava-prapañca-kathā* of Siddharsi (A.D. 905), the *Tilakamañjarī* of Dhanapāla (A.D. 968-72), the *Dharmaparīkṣās* of Hariṣeṇa (A.D. 988), Amitagati (A.D. 993-1016), Nayasena (A.D. 1125) and others, the *Vikrama-kathās* the *Ratnacūḍa-kī-kathā*, the *Śuka-saptati* and the *Pañcākhyāna*.

Among Jaina playwrights, the outstanding names are Rāmacandrasūri (A.D. 1150-75) and Hastimalla (*c.* A.D. 1250), each having written a number of nice sanskrit plays.

CHAPTER XII

CULTURAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE JAINAS

THE one thousand years, from 100 B.C. to A.D. 900, cover the better part of what is known as the ancient period of Indian history. It was during this millennium that Indian civilization was at its highest and its cultural progress most vigorous. Indians not only had permanent contacts and maintained communication with the outside world but also took their culture to far off lands, both in the west and in the east, indianized the indigenous peoples of those countries, established many indianised kingdoms and founded Indian colonies. Together with the abundance of its own resources brisk foreign trade made India the most prosperous and wealthy country in the then civilised world. A settled society that guaranteed security and leisure was best suited for thinking minds to blossom and for arts and sciences to flourish. Moreover, it was during these centuries that India attained a most perfect cultural unity. And among other causes this was all due principally to the mutual toleration and healthy cooperation of the three great religious systems, the Brahmanical, the Buddhist and the Jaina, which amicably flourished side by side in almost every part of the country and drew their adherents from almost all sections of the people. All the three vied with each other in making the life of the people nobler and happier and in enriching the national culture with the finest specimens of art and architecture, and of literature and scientific learning. No wonder, therefore, that the best and the greatest number of Jaina contributions to Indian culture belong to this period.

The most distinctive contribution of Jainism to art was in the realm of iconography. As with everything else in life the Jainas appear to have carried their spirit of acute analysis and asceticism into the sphere of art and architecture. There are minute details, for instance in the *Mānasāra*, which show that there was a regular system of sculpture and architecture to which the workers were expected strictly to conform.[1] Innumerable Jaina images made of stone, metal and even of gems are available. As Walhouse has remarked, "The Jainas delighted in making their images of all substances and sizes, but almost always invariable in attitude whether that be seated or standing. Most of the images belong to the Digambara sect or school, and are nude. Small portable images of the Saint are made of crystal, alabaster, soap-stone, blood-stone, and various other materials; while the larger are carved from whatever kind of stone is locally available."[2] At the same time, there is no period or century in the annals of Indian art for which ample material relating to Jaina religious sculpture is not available.[3] K.P. Jayaswal had discovered a Jaina image of the Maurya period.[4] The Hāthīgumphā inscription of Khāravela (2nd century B.C.) speaks of the setting up of an image of the Jina in Kaliṅga.[5] Next in age but perhaps the greatest religious establishment of the Jainas was at the Kaṅkālī Ṭīlā site in Mathurā. It had a continued history of about 1400 years (2nd century B.C. to A.D.

---

[1] *JA*, I. 3. pp. 45-45 ('Jaina Art in South India' by Prof. S. R. Sharma); Smith, *History of Fine Arts in India and Ceylon*, pp. 267-68.

[2] Smith, op. cit., p. 238.

[3] *JA*, III. 4, pp. 83-84.

[4] *JBORS*, March 1937, p. 130.

[5] *EI*, XX, p. 88.

1100), and the sculptured treasures found at this place are of the greatest aesthetic and iconographic value.[1] Specimens of Jaina icons and sculptures from Rajgir (Bihar), Udayagiri (Bhilsā), Kahaum, Deogarh, Chanderī, Khajurāho, and various other places in the North and from different parts of Maharastra, Andhra, Karnataka and the Tamil countries, belonging to this period, speak eloquently of the development of the art of sculpture at the hands of the Jainas. The Tīrthaṅkara images, which no doubt are the most abundant, do afford some ground for the criticism that they are uniform and give little scope for display of individual genius, but in the representation of numerous lesser deities belonging to the Jaina pantheon and of the scenes from the traditional life-stories of the Tīrthankaras and other celebrities of yore the artist was not restricted by any prescribed formulae and had much greater freedom. He also could and actually did give full play to his genius in carving secular scenes from contemporary life, which are sometimes marvellous, highly informative and full of aesthetic beauty. The Jaina art of Mathura and of several other places abounds with such stray pieces of sculpture, including votive tablets, stone railings and bas-reliefs.[2] Then, in the Jaina religious art many common elements with the Brahmanical and the Buddhist art are found and there are evidences of mutual give and take.[3] Hence there is no doubt that the subject

---

[1] *JA*, III. 4, p. 88.

[2] Certain forms of sculpture of which the artistic Āyāgapaṭṭas from Mathura of the Śuṅga-Kuṣana period represent one, are peculiarly Jaina and perhaps solely the creation of this creed.

[3] V. S. Agarwal, 'Some Brahmanical Deities in Jaina Religious Art' (*JA*, III. 4, pp. 83-92); S. K. Jain, 'Some Common Elements in the Jaina and Hindu Pantheons' (*JA*, XVIII. 2, & XIX. 1).

of Jaina iconography is of great importance for a proper reconstruction of the religious history of ancient India. The quantum of available material justifies the claim of Jaina art for discussion in a special treatise.

Another peculiar contribution of the Jainas, not only to the South Indian but also to the whole of Indian or even Eastern art, is the free standing pillar found in front of almost every *basadi* or Jaina temple in South India. There are about twenty such pillars in the district of South Canara alone.[1] The Mathura Jaina Elephant Capital of the year 38 (or A.D. 116), the Kahaum Jaina pillar with the image of Pañca-Jinendra carved on it (G.E. 141 or A.D. 460), the Deogarh Jaina pillar of the reign of Bhojadeva of Kannauj (V.E. 919 or A.D. 862) and the Jaina Victory pillar of Chittor are some of the available North Indian examples. The Jaina pillars are generally known as the *Mānastambhas* and are tall and elegant structures with a small pavillion at the top on the capital, surmounted by a small dome or *śikhara*. They are quite different from the *Dipastambhas* (lamp-posts) of Hindu temples. Walhouse remarks, "The whole capital and canopy (of Jaina pillars) are a wonder of light, elegant, lightly decorated stone work; and nothing can surpass the stately grace of these beautiful pillars whose proportions and adaptations to surrounding scenery are always perfect and whose richness of decoration never offends."[2]

Apart from these pieces of individual statuary or architectural work, the Jainas are said to have distinguished themselves by their decorative sculpture, and to have attained a considerable degree of excellence in

[1] S. R. Sharma, 'Jaina Art in South India' (*JA*, I., 3, p. 52).
[2] *IA*, V, p. 39.

the perfection of their pillared chambers which were their favourite form of architecture. These took various shapes and gave full play to a variety of designs, differing according to the locality, the nature of the climate or the substance available out of which to execute their artistic ideals.[1] About these ancient and mediaeval temples of South India, Logan observes, "The Jainas seem to have left behind them one of their peculiar styles of temple architecture; for the Hindu temples, and even the Mohammedan mosques of Malabar, are all built in the style peculiar to the Jainas, as it is still to be seen in the Jaina *basadis* at Mūḍabidri and other places in South Canara."[2] About the pillars found in these temples, Fergusson says, "Nothing can exceed the richness or the variety with which they are carved. No two pillars are alike, and many are ornamented to an extent that may almost seem fantastic. Their massiveness and richness of carving bear evidence to their being copies of wooden models."[3] Some of these temples have been declared by reputed connoisseurs of art as the finest specimens of ancient Indian architecture. In fact, many of the decorative carvings are so full of human interest that the austere asceticism which symbolised itself in the huge, stoic and naked Tīrthankara images was more than counter-balanced by the abundance and variety of these sculptures which in a sense

---

[1] S. R. Sharma, op. cit., p. 53.

[2] Logan, *Malabar*, pp. 88, etc.

[3] Fergusson, *A History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, II, pp. 78-79. An inscription curiously confirms the practice of making such wooden models (cf., Rice, *Coorg Inscs.*, *EC*, I. 10, p. 56). On these Jaina temples also see Buchanan's *Travels*, III, pp. 132-33; *Bombay Gazetteer*, XXI, p. 540; *MER*, 1916-17, pp. 113-14; *MAR*, 1925, p. 1; *EC*, II, Introduction, pp. 32-33; Havell, *Ancient and Mediaeval Architecture of India*, p. 68.

gave expression to the later and emotional Jainism. Another feature of Jaina art is the representation of the Nāga. Snake images are very frequent about Jaina temples, particularly in Mysore and Canara. And it may be said that it is the Nāga that binds together and gives unity to the various religions of South India.[1]

As regards cave architecture, the early Jaina monks being mostly forest recluses (*Vanavāsīs*), the Jaina caves of Bihar (Barabar hills and Rajgir), Orissa (Khaṇḍagiri and Udayagiri), Saurashtra (Girinagar), Central India (Udayagiri and Rāmagiri), Andhra (Rāma Koṇḍa), Karnataka (Chandragiri), extreme South (Tinnemalai and Sittanavasala), Deccan (Nasik) and other parts, situated far from human habitation, served as veritable, though temporary, refuges for the wandering Jaina ascetics. But from the 3rd-4th century A.D. onwards the practice of *Caityavāsa* or living a more or less settled life in temples and establishments generally in or near habitation gradually gained ground. It is why in the days of Ajanta and Ellora we find but few Jaina caves being built. As Smith says, 'the varying practical requirements of the cult of each religion, of course, had an effect on the nature of the buildings required for particular purposes.'[2] Hence the paucity of Jaina caves in later times, as compared with either Buddhists or Brahmanical ones, is a strong commentary upon those who adversely reflect upon the ascetic nature of the Jaina religion. The importance attached to the lay community, as well as the active part played in worldly life by the Jaina monks, must largely account for the fact that although like the Buddhists the Jainas had a monastic organisation it never attained power

[1] Fergusson, op. cit., I, pp. 42-44.
[2] Smith, *History of Fine Arts in India and Ceylon*, p. 9.

like that of the Buddhist order.[1] According to Burgess, as against 720 Buddhist and 160 Brahmanical we have only 35 Jaina cave-temples. The earliest of these belong to the 5th or 6th century A.D. and the latest perhaps to the 12th. They are all Digambara and include some very fine specimens.[2]

By far the most interesting caves of the Jainas from the artistic point of view, are the groups called the Indrasabhā and the Jagannātha Sabhā at Ellora. They constitute a maze of excavations leading from one into another. Percy Brown says, "No other temple at Ellora is so complete in its arrangements or so finished in its workmanship as the upper storey of the Indrasabhā; all the large sunk panels between pilasters on every wall being filled with figure subjects, while the pillars, admirably spaced, and on occasion joined by dwarf walls, are moulded, fluted and faceted, as in no other instance."[3]

Almost adjoining to the Indrasabhā is the Jagannātha Sabhā, similar in general plan but smaller in size. Its walls are aslo recessed for figure sculpture, and the pillars are richly carved in the style in which the Jaina artist excels. As Burgess says, "The architects, who excavated the two Sabhās at Elurā, deserve a prominent place among those, who, regardless of all utilitarian considerations, sought to convert the living rock into quasi-eternal temples in honour of their gods."[4]

In fact, in India rock-hewn architecture reached its highest development in the region of the Western

---

1 ibid., p. 11.

2 Burgess, *Cave Temples of India*, pp. 170-71.

3 P. Brown, *Indian Architecture (Hindu & Buddhist)*, p. 140.

4 Burgess, op. cit., p. 510; also see his Report on the *Cave Temples in Western India*, pp. 44 ff.

Ghats. The caves of Ajanta are the first, but "though the series at Ellora commenced nearly at the time when the excavations at Ajanta ceased, immense interest is added by the introduction of temples belonging to the Hindu and Jaina religions, affording a varied picture of the mythology of India during the period of its greatest vigour, such as is nowhere else to be found."[1] Ellora served as a veritable meeting place of Brahmanism, Buddhism and Jainism and perhaps is the most suitable place for a comparative study of the art developed by them.[2]

Yet Ellora forms one of a group; there are others, more ancient, further south, for example, the Jaina excavations at Badāmī, Aihole, Patañy, Ṅasik, Dhārāśiva, Ankai and Junagarh, as well as at Kulumulu (in the Tinnevelly district). The caves of Dhārāśiva (37 miles north of Solapur) are perhaps the largest of these, and that of Kulumulu, now used by the Śaivas, is described as 'a gem of its class.'[3] The Nasik caves have a large number of cells or halls for the monks and indicate the existence of a large establishment and centre of learning there in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa period. Those at Ankai, in Khandesh district, though smaller, have some very beautiful female dancing figures on petals bearing musical instruments. It may be noted here that these excavations are not copies of structural buildings, but are "rock-cut examples, which had grown up into a style of their own, distinct from that of structural edifices."[4] The early Jaina caves were more in the form

---

[1] *Report of Archaeological Survey of Western India*, Vol. V; *Hyderabad, A Guide to Art and Architecture*, 1951.

[2] ibid.

[3] cf., S. R. Sharma, op. cit.

[4] Fergusson, op. cit., p. 7.

of natural caverns such as are found at Sittannavasal and other places in the erstwhile Pudukotta state in South India. Some of them contain polished stone-beds which are rightly believed to be *Sallekhana* beds of Jaina ascetics. Inscriptions in the Brāhmī script of 3rd-2nd century B.C. found therein conclusively show them to be *Adhiṣṭhānamah* or Jaina monasteries. They were probably the places of resort for worship or penance and continued to be so till the 7th-9th centuries A.D. when under the Pallava rulers of Siṁhaviṣṇu's line cave-temples were scooped out of the rocks. The cave-temples on the western slopes of the Sittannavasal hill cut in the time of Mahendravarman I (7th century A.D.), are resorted to even to this day by Jaina pilgrims from different parts of South India.[1] From the 10th century A.D. onwards, however, structural architecture began to replace rock-hewn architecture. The rock-cut style seems to have been a sort of passing episode in the architectural history of the Jainas and was dropped by them when it was no longer wanted. Fine structural edifices began to be built in this period but the ruins of only a few have survived. This branch of Jaina architecture was mostly developed from 9th to 15th century A.D. and saw its climax in that period in the South as well as the North.

The earliest form of Jaina architecture seems to have been the Stūpa. The Jaina Vodva Stūpa unearthed at the Kaṅkālī Ṭīlā site of Mathura has been considered as not only one of the oldest structures of that type but also as one of the earliest discovered buildings in India apart from the Indus Valley discoveries. Dr.

[1] K. R. Venkataramana, 'The Jainas in Pudukkotta State,' *AIOC*, IX th Session, Trivandrum, 1937; *JA*, III. 4, pp. 103-106.

Fuhrer who superintended the excavation of the Stūpa said, "The Stūpa was so ancient at the time when the inscription was incised that its origin had been forgotten. On the evidence of the characters the date of the inscription may be referred with certainty to the Indo-Scythian era and is equivalent to A.D. 156. The Stūpa must, therefore, have been built several centuries before the beginning of the Christian era, for the name of its builders would assuredly have been known if it had been erected during the period when the Jainas of Mathura carefully kept record of their donations."[1] In fact, as J. Fleet observed, "The prejudice that all Stūpas and stone-railings must necessarily be Buddhist, has probably prevented the recognition of Jaina structures as such, and up to the present, only two undoubtedly Jaina Stūpas have been recorded."[2] Vincent Smith also says, "In some cases, monuments which are really Jaina have been erroneously described as Buddhist."[3]

The Stūpa seems to have been a feature of the early North Indian Jaina architecture. Hence when during the post-Christ centuries Jainism went on declining in the north, at the same time gaining greater and greater strength in the south and the Deccan, the Niṣadyā of Karṇāṭaka type seems to have replaced the Stūpa as a funeral monument. These Niṣadyās or Chatrīs are often found bearing foot-prints of the saints in whose honour they were erected. Still the practice of erecting Stūpas did not altogether cease as we find evidence of their erection at Mathura, Hastināpura, etc.,

---

[1] cf., *Museum Report*, 1890-91. But if the year 78 of the Insc. is taken to be in the E.S.E. of 66 B.C., its date would be A.D. 12.

[2] *Imperial Gazetteer*, II, p. 111.

[3] V. Smith, *Jaina Stupa*, etc., pp. 4 ff.

even in mediaeval times.[1]

The Jainas did not lag behind in the realm of painting either, though perhaps their paintings did not attain the standard of the immaculate Buddhist frescoes of Ajanta. Traces of old paintings are still to be seen on the ceilings of Jaina caves at Ellora. There are also some at Kāñcīpura and Tirumalai in the south.[2] Dubreuil has drawn attention to others at Sittannavasal near Tanjore, assigned to the 7th century A.D.[3] These paintings are in a rock-cut temple and are akin in style to Ajanta. More interesting are those of Tirumalai (N. Arcot). Smith says, "the Jaina holy place at Tirumalai is remarkable as possessing the remains of a set of wall and ceiling paintings ascribed, on the evidence of inscriptions, to the 11th century A.D."[4] Traces exist of still older paintings covered up by the existing works.[5] Art of mural painting continued with the Jainas even in later times and on the walls of the Maṭha at Belgola there are several examples of how the chief tenets of their religion were sought to be inculcated by means of this art. Symbolic representations of religious tenets, scenes from Jaina *purāṇas* and even secular subjects like a South Indian king's court, and so on, were handled by the Jaina artists.[6] Miniature painting, the art of illustrating manuscripts with pictures, even writing whole stories in pictures, and

[1] cf., J. P. Jain, *Hastināpura* (pub. by U. P. Government).

[2] cf., Coomaraswami, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art.*

[3] ibid., p. 89; Dubreuil, *Pallava Painting*, p. 3; *IHQ*, II. 2, p. 303.

[4] Smith, *History of Fine Arts in India and Ceylon*, p. 344; *EI*, IX, p. 229.

[5] S. R. Sharma, op. cit.

[6] ibid., On Jaina paintings also see N. C. Mehta's *Indian Painting*, p. 33; Brown, *Indian Painting*, pp. 38-51; and Smith, *History of Fine Arts in India and Ceylon*, p. 133

calligraphy, in which also the Jainas attained a high degree of excellence, belong to later times.

Another form of Jaina art developed in this period is that of inscribing on rock or copperplates, some of which are of no less artistic interest than they are of historical value. The Kudlur plates of Narasiṁha Gaṅga, for example, are literature, art and history rolled in one. Particularly noteworthy in it is the seal which is beautifully executed. The banners of Jaina kings are also not without interest. Those of Ganga Parmādi and Hastimalla indicate the stamp and symbol of Jainism, viz., the Piccha Dhvaja, described as 'the banner of the divine Arhat.'[1] A study of Jaina religious and mystic symbols is likely to help in determining the authorship of many an antiquarian finds and in determining the influence of Jainism on the coins and seals, and grants and ensigns of a number of ancient states and rulers.[2]

The Jainas showed taste in always selecting the best views for their temples and caves. At Ellora they came perhaps too late when the best sites had already been appropriated by the Buddhists and the Śaivas, but speaking of the Jaina ruins at Hampi, Longhurst observes, "Unlike the Hindus, the Jainas almost invariably selected a picturesque site for their temples, valuing rightly the effect of environment on architecture."[3] The hill originally occupied by them, south of the great Pampāpati temple, is significantly called the Hemakūṭam or the Golden peak.[4] There is also not a more picturesque spot in the vicinity than that chosen

[1] ibid., *EI*, III, p. 165; *IA*, XVIII, p. 313.
[2] cf., 'Jaina Coins', *JSB*, XVIII. 2, pp. 110-122.
[3] Longhurst, *Hampi Ruins*, p. 99.
[4] ibid., pp. 25-26.

and occupied by the Jainas at Śravaṇa Belgola, their chief centre in the South.[1] Similarly, Muḍabidri, their great stronghold in South Canara, is marked by natural beauty and convenience and shows how wise the Jainas were in choosing the site for their establishments.[2]

Other fine arts like dancing and music were also cultivated by the Jainas, as these formed part of their religious devotion and ritual. The Jaina literature, paintings and sculptures of the period have numerous representations of or references to these arts.

In the field of epigraphy, the Baḍlī inscription of M.E. 84 (or 443 B.C) is the earliest dated Indian inscription and that, too, in the Mahāvīra era. The Hāthīgumphā inscription of Khāravela occupies a unique position in the source material of Indian history for the centuries preceding the Christian era. It also proves that Jainism entered Orissa, and probably became the State religion within 100 years of Mahāvīra. It may also be noted that it is the first known inscription which uses the name Bhāratavarṣa (भरधवस) for our country.

Next come the numerous inscriptions from Mathura of the Śuṅga, Kṣatrapa and Kuṣaṇa periods, quite a number of which are dated. Vincent Smith says about them, "The inscriptions are replete with information as to the organisation of the Jaina church in sections known as Gana, Kula and Śākhā, and supply excellent illustrations of the Jaina books. Both inscriptions and sculptures give interesting details, proving the existence of Jaina nuns and the influential position in the Jaina church occupied by women. The plates (published by Bühler in *EI*, Vol. I) throw light, among other things, on the history of the Indian or Brāhmī alphabet, on

[1] S. R. Sharma, op. cit.

[2] cf., Sturrock, *South Canara*, I, pp. 87-88.

the grammar and idiom of the Prākṛt dialects, on the development of Indian arts, and on the history, organisation and worship of the followers of this Indian religions."[1] They undoubtedly contain valuable information about contemporary life, society, customs, manners, fashions and even things political.

From the 2nd-3rd century onwards up to the 10th century we have only a few inscriptions in northern India, scattered over Mathura, Bihar, Bengal, Central and Western India, some of which are quite important. But it is the South—the Deccan, Konkan, Karnataka, Andhra, Tuluva and Tamil lands—which during the next centuries abound with numerous Jaina inscriptions, on stone, images, temples and monuments, copper-plate grants and other donative records. They are full of valuable historical information and many of them are dated. A large number of them have been published and are being utilized for historical purposes. Yet quite a number of them still remains unnoticed. Without the help of these records the history of almost none of the ruling dynasties, big or small, belonging to the regions south of the Vindhyas could have been fully reconstructed, whereas some of them owe their historical and chronological reconstruction almost wholly to Jaina epigraphic records. As Dr. B. A. Saletore observes, "The numerous epigraphic records and literature of Karnataka, the Telugu and Tamil lands give us an idea of the remarkable contribution Jainism made to the stability and success of many kingdoms."[2]

Coming to literature, we have already seen that the Jainas of the period cultivated the various languages current in the country. From the Ist to the 8th century

[1] Smith, *Jaina Stupa*, etc., pp. 4 ff.
[2] B. A. Saletore, *Mediaeval Jainism*, p. 2.

A.D. Prākṛt works predominate, and the best and greatest amount of Prākṛt literature belongs to the Jainas. They began writing in Sanskrit also as early as the 1st-2nd century A.D., but it is only from A.D. 600 onwards that Sanskrit works begin to predominate, and there are quite a number of Jaina pieces of Sanskrit literature which favourably compare with the best in that language. The cultivation of the Apabhraṁśa language by the Jainas also dates from about the 7th century A.D., and in the period under review some of the best works in that language were produced. The Jainas were undoubtedly the earliest and the greatest cultivators of the Kannada language. The beginnings of the literary history of this language is traced back to the 4th-5th century A.D., and by the 10th century the Jainas had made it a well established literary language. Similarly, about the Tamil literature it has been said that the best and largest number of the available ancient classical works in that language are of Jaina authorship.[1]

The Jainas also made use of all the current literary styles, both in prose and poetry and even invented new ones such as the *Campū* (prose and poetry mixed). They did not hesitate to borrow or adopt what they thought was best in non-Jaina classical literature. Epics, purāṇic *kāvyas*, didactic pieces, devotional poems and lyrics, tales and stories, dramas and romances, allegories and satires—all these the Jaina writers of the period handled with success. Apart from their ontological,

[1] For Jaina literature in the different languages see Winternitz's *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II; R. Narsimhachar's *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*; Chakravarti's *Jaina Literature in Tamil*; and the files of *JA*, *JSB* and *Anekānta*. See also *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, Vol. IV, of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1955).

metaphysical, philosophical and ritualistic literature they wrote valuable works on logic and dialectics, ethics and politics, grammar and lexicon, poetics and prosody, yogic sciences and medicine, mathematics and astronomy, astrology and other occult arts. Here and there we get useful technical information about music, painting, sculpture, architecture and town-planning.[1] Interesting information about zoology, botany, alchemy, chemistry and other physical sciences is also not wanting. The *Purāṇas*, *Caritras* and the commentaries on the *Āgamas* are full of geographical information which can help to identify many an unidentified site and to locate new ones. We also find names of many yet unknown kingdoms, foreign lands and non-Aryan tribes.[2] The Jaina literary sources also throw a flood of light on India's inland and foreign trade both by land and sea-routes, on commerce and industry, commercial organisations and trade guilds, market conditions and economic life of the people, and on means of transport and communication. There are some vivid accounts of *sārthavāhas* or inland caravans and of mercantile navigation, even of naval military expeditions.[3] Lastly, the Jainas wrote valuable commentaries on a number of important Brahmanical and Buddhist works.[4] This highly tolerant and cooperative spirit of the Jaina scholars helped to create a harmony in the cultural

---

[1] On music see Dr. V. Raghavan in *JSB*, VII. 1, pp. 19-21; H. R. Kapadia in *Jour. Or. Inst., Baroda*, II. 8, on architecture, etc., see Dr. Motichandra in *JSB*, XIX. 2, pp. 6-18.

[2] cf., *Premī Volume* (Tikamgarh, 1946), pp. 250-68; also *JSB*, XIII. 2.

[3] cf, K. D. Bajpai, *Bhāratīya Vyāpāra kā Itihāsa*, 1951; also see Dr. Motichandra's Introduction to the same.

[4] P. C. Nahar in 1935 mentioned 150 such Jaina commentaries (*JS B*, II. 1, pp. 32-41); since then many more have come to light.

atmosphere of the times and contributed largely to the cultural unity of the country and to its all round progress which the foreign travellers visiting India in those times could not but envy.

The few, piecemeal and scattered attempts made by some scholars are enough to prove how Jaina literary traditions can corroborate the evidence of many an archaeological discovery, viz., the flood of Pāṭaliputra in the time of the Muruṇḍa kings (3rd century A.D.), the invasion and devastation of Taxila by the Turuskas (3rd century A.D.), the Jaina Stūpa of Mathura, the Kalki tradition, etc.[1] A perusal of the works on Greater India shows that Jaina influence as part of general Indian cultural influence can distinctly be traced in the ancient Indianized kingdoms of South-East Asia.[2] Then, apart from the strictly historical and chronological data contained in Jaina sources, the Jaina literature, epigraphic records and archaeological remains help us to reconstruct vivid pictures of life and society of different parts of the country in the different periods of its ancient history.

In fact, the millennium in question, particularly its latter half (5th-10th century A.D.) was the most flourishing period in the history of Jainism, at least in South India. In those centuries Jainism had no serious militant rival and continued to bask in the sunshine of popular and royal favour. There were other sects which

---

[1] cf., *Premī Volume*, op. cit., pp. 227-49.

[2] For instance, in those lands vegetarianism predominated and animal sacrifice was almost unknown; their year was *Kartikadi* like that of the Jainas; it is the Jaina version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* that was popular there; some of the inscriptions are found alluding to certain Jaina things, viz., Tīrthaṅkara Pārśva, the Jaina work *Kalyāṇakāraka* and so on (cf., *JSB*, XVII. 2, pp. 101-104).

were equally patronized. Philosophical disputations and literary confutations were also many and quite hot, too, but they were always taken in a sportsman-like spirit, created no ill feelings and were generally devoid of physical persecutions. India of those times knew no forcible conversions. All the different sects heartily cooperated in the welfare and uplift of the nation. The Jainas of the times, however, seem to have been ahead of others in many spheres. For example, as Dr. Altekar observes, "They seem to have taken active part in the education of the masses. That before the beginning of the alphabet proper, the children should be required to pay homage to Ganeśa by reciting the formula *Śrī Gaṇeśāya namaḥ* is natural in Hindu society, but that in the Deccan even to-day it should be followed by the Jaina formula *Oṁ namaḥ Siddhebhyaḥ* shows, as Mr. C. V. Vaidya has pointed out, that the Jaina teachers of that age had so completely controlled the mass education that the Hindus continued to teach their children this original Jaina formula even after the decline of Jainism."[1] It may be noted that the same formula in its corrupt form *Onā-māsī-dhama* has been in similar use in many indigenous Pāṭhaśālās in some parts of North India as well. The opening verse of one of Akalaṅka's (A.D. 643) works has been adopted as the *Mangala* verse in many later Jaina and even non-Jaina works and inscriptions, in the latter with the only change that for the word "Jina" occurring in the orig inal, the word "Siva" has been substituted.[2] Numerous Jaina establishments were veritable centres of learning

[1] Altekar, *RTT*, p. 309.

[2] cf., *JA*, III. 4, pp. 107-08. It can help us in putting an earlier limit to the age of some of the undated records using this *Mangala*.

and served as great Vidyāpīṭhas from which emanated the light of knowledge, which contributed to mass education and also gave specialised instruction to persons of royal families and of higher classes. Food and medicine were provided for in these Jaina Maṭhas and provision was also made for the teaching of Jaina scriptures.[1]

In those days Jainism being a progressive and popular religion could readily adapt itself to political exigencies and take active part in rejuvenating life in the country whenever called upon to do so. The practical effect of such outlook on the part of the great Jaina teachers of the period was profound, and a number of royal families like the Kadambas, the Gaṅgas, the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, came one after the other sometimes as champions and always as benevolent patrons of Jainism. The ministers, generals, feudatories and commercial magnates of these rulers followed suit. Dr. Saletore says, "Jainism in short received universal patronage from all ranks of people. And the leaders in turn reciprocated the trust and reverence which the princes and people reposed in them by contributing in a large measure to the philosophy, literature and arts of the country."[2] In fact, as Dr. Altekar observes, "It is very probable that at least one third of the total population of the Deccan of our period was following the gospel of Mahāvīra."[3] The influence of religion is estimated by the result it produces on the character of the people. And "It is gratifying to find," says Altekar, "that the Arab merchants of the age, in spite of their religious differences pay as high a compliment

[1] cf., *JBBRAS*, X, p. 237.
[2] *MJ*, op. cit., p. 7.
[3] *RTT*, op. cit., p. 310.

to the Indian character as was paid by Megasthenes and Yuan Chwang."[1] He further remarks, "It must be remembered that Jainism preaches the doctrine of Ahiṁsā in a more extreme form than Buddhism, and yet the history of the Deccan of our period shows that it had no emasculating effects upon its followers."[2] Citing a number of examples of the great Jaina men of war he goes on to say, "In the face of the achievements of Jaina princes and generals of our period, we can hardly subscribe to the theory that Jainism and Buddhism were chiefly responsible for the military emasculation of the population that led to the fall of Hindu India."[3] There is ample evidence to show that the Jainas in large numbers used to enlist in the army and distinguish themselves on the battlefield.[4]

Jainism had gradually popularised itself to such an extent that there was left little outward difference in the rituals, modes of worship and religious celebrations between itself and Hinduism. Often in the same temple Jaina and Brahmanical and even Buddhist gods were installed side by side.[5] Jaina pontiffs like Jinasena Svāmi (A.D. 770-850) deviated from the orthodox path in adopting many rules and practices enjoined by the Brahmanical *Dharmaśāstras* and in prescribing them for the Jainas as well. Wide and sympathetic toleration was the characteristic of the age. It seemed as if the people had realised that there was no cultural difference between the different prevailing religions and that an

[1] ibid., p. 314; For Al Idrisi's observations, see Eliott, I, p. 88.

[2] *RTT*, op. cit., pp. 315-16.

[3] ibid.

[4] ibid., p. 250 and Ch. XIV; *MJ*, op. cit., Ch. IV.

[5] *RTT*, op. cit., pp. 278-79. *IA*, XVIII, p. 274; IV, p. 181; X. p. 388.

individual might follow any one of them or make a combination of the acceptable elements of any one or more of them as suited his temperament, somewhat in the manner of a modern man of culture who does not realise any inconsistency in simultaneously becoming a member of different social, cultural and political societies. A certain amount of feeling was no doubt exhibited in philosophical writings and verbal disputations, but even in these behind the superficial clash there was an inner movement of synthesis. Even the revival of Brahmanism did not affect the fortunes of Jainism for a considerable time, due firstly to royal patronage under a number of ruling families including their official, feudal and mercantile nobility and secondly due to the influence of the work and achievements of a host of illustrious Jaina saints and authors.

Ahiṁsā in all its positive implications, self-abnegation and asceticism were very popular. No Vedic sacrifices are heard of in this period. The *Aśvamedha Yajñas* of the early Kadambas and Pallavas, too, seem to have been performed without the accompaniment of animal sacrifice and in later times even such token *Yajñas* were given up. Even Kumārila's advocacy did not attract people. And in spite of Sankara's teachings, the Brahmanical form of *sanyāsa* did not gain any popularity in those days. The age marked a phenomenal decline of Buddhism, due, among other causes, to Śaṅkara's vehement attacks (*c.* A.D. 800) against it. Hence the Samānis (Śramaṇas) and Sanyāsins whom the Arab merchants and travellers like Sulaiman and Al Idrisi visiting India in the early mediaeval times saw, must have been Jaina Śramaṇas or Munis. These Jaina ascetics were no more forest recluses nor were they like the Śaiva Mahantas or later Jaina Bhaṭṭārakas both of whom were

Sanyāsins merely in name and lived the life of rich landlords and property-owners. They were, on the other hand, selfless, possessionless and sincere servants of religion, Sarasvatī and humanity. They lived in temples or *basadis* or in bigger establishments, and freely mixed with the people. They acted as spiritual guides, confessors, teachers, sympathetic advisers, physicians and even astrologers. They inspired philanthropic acts and chari ies, encouraged arts and cultivated literature, both religious and secular. They inspired love and respect, and all classes of people, both men and women, considered it an essential daily duty to honour the guru, serve his needs, obey his injunctions and follow his advice. Worship of the gods, serving the guru, reading the scriptures, self-control, penances and charities constituted the sixfold essential daily religious routine of every member of the laity. The guru was the living embodiment of Dharma and served all the purposes of the daily religion of the devotee. And the guru's greatest and unceasing insistence was on the performance of *Caturvidha-dāna* by every devotee to the latter's utmost capacity. This act of utmost yet common piety consisted in supplying food and other necessaries of life to the guru, food and protection to the destitute, protection of life to all living beings, medicine and medical aid to the needy, and means of education and knowledge in the form of scriptures, books, schools, colleges and scholarships to all. The system thus fulfilled all the higher philanthropic, humanitarian, moral and intellectual needs of the society, and no wonder it was popular with all classes of people.[1]

[1] Benoy Kumar Sarkar has classified these four gifts under the term 'Positivism of the Jainas', in his *Creative India from Mohenjodaro to the Age of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda* (Lahore, 1937), pp. 41-44.

Numerous Jaina works of the time shed valuable light on contemporary life and society. A few attempts have already been made to portray it on the basis of some of these sources.[1] There is ample scope for many more such attempts. From the Jaina story literature of the 7th-9th century A.D. 'the general impression one gets of the life and times is one of peace and plenty. The variety of eatables, the number of pastimes and the richness of costumes all bear eloquent testimony to this. In this age of leisure and abundance people lived vigorously. There is certainly no lack, in some sections, of vices which such a life naturally produces. Hating poverty as a sin and making work a sacred duty, each unit was engaged in its specified occupation, though agriculture was in the main, most important. A belief in ultimate justice legal or natural, was strangely combined with the beliefs in such things as astrology, witchcraft and the science of medicine. Socially and politically they were well organised though both were founded on a strong religious bias. The institution of Śreṣṭhī (head-merchant) had its significant place in their society. In short, life was varied, plentiful, vigorous with strong prejudices and native frailties.'[2] Some of the works give vivid pictures of feudal life as also of the inner life of royal palaces.[3] And the Jaina didactic literature of the period is remarkably expressive of a hunger and thirst after righteousness. A strong sense

[1] cf., B. C. Law, *India as depicted in Early Texts of Buddhism & Jainism* (London, 1941); J. C. Jain, *Life in Ancient India as depicted in the Jaina Canons* (Bombay, 1947); K. K. Handique, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture* (Solapur, 1949), etc.

[2] cf., 'Life in Kannaḍa Vaḍḍārādhane,' *c.* A.D. 800 (AIOC, 14th session, Lucknow, 1951, pp. 188 ff.).

[3] Such as Puspadanta's *Mahāpurāṇa*, Somadeva's *Yaśastilaka*, Dhanapāla's *Tilaka-mañjarī*, all belonging to 10th century.

of moral obligation, an earnest aspiration for good, a fervent and unselfish charity and generally a loftiness of aims that are very impressive, pervade a number of these Jaina ethical works and they must have been important factors in shaping the character and ideas of the people.

To conclude, it may be observed that Jainism, Jaina art and literature and all other Jaina contributions to Indian culture as also the Jainas themselves of the past or the present do not stand isolated. They are an inalienable part and parcel of India and whatever it stands for. It would be suicidal to ignore Jaina things as something alien or merely sectarian, and it would only be proper to study them in the background of Indian religion, culture and history as a whole with a catholicity of outlook, unbiassed approach and balanced judgement. There was a time when lack of information and paucity of material stood in our way. But since the last quarter of the 19th century when the oriental scholars first got access to the Jaina Bhandāras, due to the efforts of some provincial governments, the keen interest taken by some Western universities in Indological studies, the untiring zeal of some individual scholars and the contagion caught by a number of Jaina workers in the field and by some Jaina institutions, a large number of Jaina manuscripts have been brought to light. Many of them have been collected and catalogued by experts. The reports prepared by Bhandarkar, Peterson, Hiralal and others contained such a rich harvest of new material that many scholars have come to be interested in the study of Jaina literature and chronology as part of Indian literature and history. The tendency is gathering strength and momentum as more and more new Bhaṇḍāras are being ransacked, new ma-

nuscripts found and standard editions of important texts published. Jaina inscriptions, antiquarian remains and monuments had begun to be taken notice of even earlier and their value duly assessed. Attempts at correlation of literary, epigraphic and archaeological evidence have started. And the work done in this direction has disproved the charge that used to be levelled against Indian literature in general that it was wanting in historical facts and chronological data. The details about many Jaina authors and their contemporaries and predecessors already brought to light by Bühler, Bhandarkar, Peterson, etc. from literary sources, by Rice, Narsimhachar and others from epigraphic sources and by some scholars even from archaeological and other historical sources were not only reliable but proved also to be valuable landmarks in Indian history and literature. The work which has subsequently been done in these directions has not only confirmed the above conclusions but has widened the scope of possibilities which will take long to be fully exhausted. As V. Smith once remarked, "The field of exploration is vast. In olden days the creed of Mahāvīra was far more widely diffused than it is now. In the 7th century A.D., for instance, the creed had numerous followers in Vaiśālī (north of Patna) and in eastern Bengal, localities where its adherents are now extremely few. I have myself seen abundant evidences of the former prevalence of Jainism in Bundelkhand during the mediaeval period especially in the 11th-12th centuries. Jaina images in the country are numerous in places where a Jaina is now never seen. Further south, in the Deccan and the Tamil countries, Jainism was, for centuries, a great and ruling power in regions where it is now almost unknown."[1]

[1] cf., *Modern Review*, 1915, pp. 519-22.

Hence the urgent need of finding out, collecting, coordinating and publishing Jaina materials of history and their importance as valuable sources for the history of ancient India cannot be denied. They at least constitute a body of important corroborative and supplementary material in general, though they do not altogether want in absolutely new facts and throw light on certain hitherto undiscovered aspects and are generally rich in chronological data.

APPENDIX A

DYNASTIC CHRONOLOGY FROM MAHĀVĪRA'S NIRVĀNA TO M.E. 1000

ACCORDING to the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*[1]—

(*a*) The Śaka king came in M.E. 461 or (according to another tradition) in M.E. 605

(*b*)

The Śaka king came in M.E.	..	461 years
His dynasty ruled for	..	242 years
The Guptas	..	255 years
Caturmukha Kalki	..	42 years
TOTAL	..	1,000 years

(*c*) Simultaneously with the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra,

---

[1](अ) वीर जिणे सिद्धिगदे चउसद-इगिसट्ठि वास परिमाणो।
कालम्मि अदिक्कते उप्पण्णो एत्थ सगराओ॥८६॥
णिव्वाणे वीर जिणे छव्वास सदेसु पचवरिसेसु।
पणमासेसु गदेसु सजादो सगणिओ अहवा॥८६॥

(ब) णिव्वाणगदे वीरे चउसद इगिसट्ठि वासविच्छेदे।
जादोय सगणरिंदो रज्ज वस्सस्स दुसय बादाला॥६३॥
दोण्गिसदा पणवण्णा गुत्ताण चउमुहस्स बादाल।
वस्स होंदि सहस्स केई एवं परूवती॥६४॥

(स) ज काले वीर जिणो णिस्सेयस सपय समावण्णो।
तक्काले अभिसित्तो पालयणामो अवतिसुदो॥६५॥
पालक रज्ज सट्ठिम् इगिसय पणवण्ण विजयवंसभवा।
चाल मरुदयवसा तीस वसा सु पुस्समित्तंमि॥६६॥
वसुमित्त अग्गिमित्ता सट्ठी गद्दब्भया वि सयमेक्क।
णहवाहणो य चाल तत्तो भच्छट्ठणा जादा॥६७॥
भच्छट्ठणाण कालो दोण्णि सयाइं हवंति बादाला।
तत्तो गुत्तातापं रज्जे दोण्णि सयाणि इगितीसा॥६८॥
तत्तो कक्की जादो इंदसुदो तस्स चउमुहो णामो।
सत्तरिवरिसा आऊ विगुणिय इगिवीस रज्जत्तो॥६६॥

Pālaka, the son of (the lord of) Avanti was crowned.

Pālaka	60 years
The Vijayavaṁśa	155 years
The Marudayavaṁśa	40 years
Pusyamitra	30 years
Vasumitra and Agnimitra ..	60 years
The Gaddava dynasty	100 years
Nahavāhana	40 years
The Bhacchaṭṭhanān	242 years
The Guptas	231 years
Caturmukha Kalki, son of Indra	42 years
TOTAL ..	1,000 years

(*d*) The Ācārāṅgadhārīs lasted till

M.E.	683 years
Kalki was crowned after an interval of	275 years
and he ruled for	42 years
TOTAL ..	1,000 years

(द) आचारगधरादो पणहत्तरि जुत्त दुसय वासेसु।
वोलीणेसु बद्धो पट्टो कक्कीस णरवइणो ॥१००॥
अहसाहियूण कक्की णियजोग्गे जणपदे पयत्तेण।
सुक्क जाचदि लुद्धो पिक्क जावतावसमणाओ ॥१०१॥
अह के वि असुरदेवा. . .
तक्कक्की मारेदि हु धम्मदोहित्ति ॥१०३॥
कक्किसुतो अजिदजयणामो . . . .
धम्मे रज्ज करेज्जंति ॥१०४॥
तत्तो दोवे वासो सम्मधम्मोपयट्ठदि जणाण. . . . ॥१०५॥
एव वस्स सहस्से पुह कक्की हवेइ एक्केको।
पचसयवच्छरेसु एक्केको तहय उवकक्की ॥१०६॥

—*Tiloyapaṇṇati*, चतुर्थं महाधिकारा:।

Benevolent rule of Kalki's son,		
Ajitañjaya	.. .. ..	2 years

After every 1,000 years a Kalki is born and after every 500 years an Upakalki.

The dynastic list according to Jinasena's *Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783) is [1]:

Pālaka	.. ..	60 years
The Vijaya kings	.. .. ..	155 years
The Muruṇḍas	.. .. ..	40 years
Pusyamitra	.. ..	30 years
Vasumitra and Agnimitra	..	60 years
The Rāsabha kings	.. .. ..	100 years
Naravāhana	.. ..	40 years
The Bhaṭṭavānas	.. .. ..	242 years
The Guptas	.. ..	231 years
Kalki	.. ..	42 years
TOTAL	..	1,000 years

---

[1] वीर निर्वाण काले च पालकोऽत्राभिषिच्यते।
लोकेऽवति सुतो राजा प्रजानाम् प्रतिपालक.॥
षष्ठिवर्षाणि तद्राज्य ततोविजयभूभुजाम्।
शतं च पच पचाशद् वर्षाणि तदुदीरित॥
चत्वारिशन्मुरुण्डानाम् भूमण्डलमखण्डितम्।
त्रिशत्तू पुष्यमित्राणा षष्टिर्वस्वाग्निमित्रयोः॥
शतरासभ राजाना नरवाहनमप्यत।
चत्वारिशत्ततो द्वाभ्या चत्वारिशच्छतद्वय॥
भट्टवाणस्य तद्राज्यागुप्ताना च शतद्वय।
एक विशश्च वर्षाणि काल विद्भिरुदाहृत॥*
द्विचत्वारिशदेवातः कल्किराजस्य राजता।
ततोऽजितजयो राजा स्यादिन्द्रपुर संस्थितः॥
वर्षाणा षट्शती त्यक्त्वा पंचाग्रमास पंचकम्।
मुक्तिम् गते महावीरे शकराजस्ततोऽभवत्॥
मुक्तिम् गते महावीरे प्रतिवर्ष सहस्रक।
एकैको जायते कल्की जिनधर्म विरोधकः॥

—*Harivaṁśa*, sarga 60, vv. 487-92, 551-52.

Then ruled Ajitañjaya at Indrapura. 605 years and 5 months after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* rose the Śaka king. Beginning from Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* after every 1,000 years an anti-religious Kalki will be born.

It would be seen that this list of the *Harivaṁśa* is almost identical with the corresponding list of the *Tiloyapaṇṇati*, the individual periods as also the total are the same, but names of some kings or dynasties are differently spelt, e.g., Muruṇḍas for Marudaya, Rāsabha for Gadavvas, Bhaṭṭavāṇa for Bhacchaṭṭhanāṇ (Bhadra Caṣṭanas).

Almost the same list is repeated in the *Dhavala* (A.D. 780), the *Jayadhavala* (A.D. 837), the *Uttarapurāṇa* (A.D. 898), the *Trilokasāra* (A.D. 973) and other Digambara works.

The corresponding Śvetāmbara tradition is contained in the *Titthogāli-painna*, an old Prākṛt text[1]:

Pālaka	.. ..	60 years
The Nandas	.. .. ..	150 years
The Mauryas	.. .. ..	160 years
Puṣyamitra ..	.. .. ..	35 years
Balamitra and Bhānumitra	..	60 years
Nabhasena ..	.. .. ..	40 years
The Gaddabhas	.. .. ..	100 years
	Total ..	605 years

[1] जरयणि सिद्धिगओ अरहा तित्थकरो महावीरो।
तरयणि अवतीए अभिसित्तो पालओ राया॥६२०॥
पालगरण्णो सट्ठी पुणपण्णसयं वियाणि नन्दाण।
मुरियाण सट्ठिसय पुणतीसा पुस्समित्ताण॥६२१॥
बलमित्ता भाणुमित्ता सट्ठा चत्ता यहोति नहसेणो।
गद्दभसयमेग पुण पडिवन्नो तो सगोराया॥६२२॥
पचमासा पच य वासा छव्वेवहोतिवाससया।
परिनिव्वु अस्सऽरि हतो तो उप्पन्नो सगोराया॥६२३॥
—*Titthogāli-painna* —*Paṭṭāvali-samuccaya*, p. 197.

Then came the Śaka king, 605 years and 5 months after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*.

The *Tīrthoddhāra-prakaraṇa* and the *Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvali*[1] give the list as:

Pālaka	60 years
The Nandas	155 years
The Mauryas	108 years
Puṣyamitra	30 years
Balamitra and Bhānumitra ..	60 years
Nahavarana	40 years
Gaddabhilla	13 years
The Sakas	4 years
TOTAL ..	470 years

Then came the Vikrama.

Merutunga in his *Vicāraśreṇī* (A.D. 1304) gives an almost identical list with the addition that Vikrama and his dynasty ruled for 135 years, after which, or 605 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*, came the Śaka king who displaced the dynasty of Vikramāditya.[2]

---

[1] जरयणि कालगओ अरिहा तित्थंकरो महावीरो।
त रयणि अवणिमवतिवई अभिसित्तो पालओराया ॥१॥
सट्ठी पालगरण्णो पण वण्ण सयतु होई णदाण।
अट्ठसय मुरियाण तीसच्चिअपूसमित्तस्स ॥२॥
बलमित्ता भाणु मित्ता सट्ठिवरसाणि चत्त नरवहणो।
तहगद्दबभिल्ल रण्जो तेरस वरिसा सगस्स चउ ॥३॥

—*Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvali.*

[2] जरयणि कालगओ अरिहातित्थंकरो महावीरो।
तं रयणिमवतिवई अहिसित्तो पालगो राया ॥
(वीर निव्वाण रयणीओ चंडपज्जोय राय पट्टम्मि।
उज्जेणीए जाओ पालय नामा महाराया ॥)
सट्ठी पालगरन्नो पणवन्न सयंतु होइ नन्दाण।
अट्ठसय मुरियाण तीसच्चिअ पूसमित्तस्स ॥

Almost the same list is repeated in the *Prabhāvaka-carita* (A.D. 1277), the *Vividha Tīrtha-kalpa* (A.D. 1332) and other Śvetāmbara works. Only Hemacandra in one place happens to observe that Candragupta came to the throne in M.E. 155.[1] In this he disagrees from all other sources and has thus caused some confusion. About the Nanda coming in M.E. 60[2] he is in agreement with all others. That the Pālaka mentioned in the lists was the son of King Caṇḍa Pradyota of Ujjayinī and that in the period of 60 years allotted to him Kuṇika and Udāyi were ruling at Pātaliputra is also corroborated by some other sources.[3] In connection with these dynastic chronologies it may, however, be noted that it is not correct to treat them as referring to the kings of Magadha. All kings and dynasties mentioned in

---

बलमित्त भाणुमित्ताण सट्ठिवरिसाणि चत्त नहवहणे।
तहगद्दभिल्ल रज्ज तेरस वासे सगस्स चउ॥
विक्कमरज्जाणंतर सतरसवासेहिं वच्छुरपवित्ती।
सेसपुण पणतीस सय विक्कम कालम्मिय पविट्ठ॥
विक्कम रज्जा रभा परओ सिरि वीर निव्वुई भणिया।
सुन्न-मुणि-वेयजुत्तो विक्कमकालाउ जिणकालो॥
श्री वीर निवृत्तेर्वर्षैं षड्भिः पचोत्तरैं शतैः।
शाकसवत्सरस्येषा प्रवृत्तिर्भरतेऽभवत्॥

—*Vicāraśreṇī.*

[1] एव च श्री महावीर मुक्तेर्वर्षशते गते।
पच पचाशदधिके चन्द्रगुप्तोऽभन्नृप.।

—*Pariśiṣṭa-parvan*, VIII. 339.

[2] अनन्तर वर्द्धमान स्वामि निर्वाण वासरात्।
गताया षष्ठि वत्सर्यामिष नन्दोऽभवन्नृप.।

—ibid., VI. 243.

[3] सिरिजिण णिव्वाण गमणरयणीए उज्जेणीए
चडपज्जो अ मरणे पालओ राजा अहिसित्तो।
तेणय अपुत्त उदाइमरणे कोणिअ रज्ज
पाडलिपुर पि अहिट्ठअं।

—cf., *Paṭṭāvali-samuccaya*, p. 17.

them are definitely known to be connected with central and western India, particularly Ujjayinī. Of course, some of them ruled over a big empire covering other parts of India including Magadha. It may be useful to estimate the truth underlying these traditions by comparing them with other Jaina chronological traditions and also with the Purānic and Buddhist traditions bearing on them.

We must also remember, as pointed out by Merutunga[1], that in these traditions a complete dynastic list in each case is not given and sometimes only a certain important king is mentioned and under his name total reign of the whole dynasty is given. It is also quite possible that in several cases the total reign periods may not prove to be the exact periods relating to Ujjayinī but may include periods before or after the respective rule lasted over Ujjayinī. This would help to explain some of the discrepancies.

---

[1] इह यदा यो राजा ख्यातिमानभूत्,
तदा तस्य राज्यं गण्यते,
न तु पट्टानुक्रम.

—*Vicāraśreṇī.*

APPENDIX B

PONTIFICAL GENEALOGY OF MAHĀVĪRA'S SUCCESSORS

THE DIGAMBARA TRADITION:

I.	1.	Gautama	.. 12	years	Total of 62 years for group I of the 3 Kevalins.
	2.	Sudharmā	.. 12	,,	
	3.	Jambu	.. 38	,,	
II.	4.	Nandi	.. 14	,,	Total of 100 years for group II of the 5 Śrutakevalins.
	5.	Nandimitra	16	,,	
	6.	Aparājita	22	,,	
	7.	Govardhana	19	,,	
	8.	Bhadrabāhu I	29	,,	
III.	9.	Viśākha	10	,,	Total of 181 years for group III of the 11 Daśapūrvadharas.
	10.	Prosthilla	19	,,	
	11.	Kṣatriya	17	,,	
	12.	Jaya	21	,,	
	13.	Nāga	18	,,	
	14.	Siddhārtha	17	,,	
	15.	Dhṛtisena	18	,,	
	16.	Vijaya	13	,,	
	17.	Buddhila	20	,,	
	18.	Gaṅgadeva	14	,,	
	19.	Sudharma	14	,,	
IV.	20.	Nakṣatra	18	,,	Total of 123 years for group IV of the 5 Ekādaśāṅgadhārīs.
	21.	Jayapāla	20	,,	
	22.	Pāṇḍu	39	,,	
	23.	Dhruvasena	14	,,	
	24.	Kansārya	32	,,	

V. 25.	Subhadra	6	,,	Total of 99 years for group V of the ten, nine and eight Aṅgadhāris.
26.	Yaśobhadra	18	,,	
27.	Bhadrabāhu II	23	,,	
28.	Lohācārya	52	,,	
VI. 29.	Arhadbali	28	,,	Total of 118 years for group VI of the 5 Ekāṅgadhāris.
30.	Māghanandi	21	,,	
31.	Dharasena	19	,,	
32.	Puṣpadanta	30	,,	
33.	Bhūtabali	20	,,	

Simultaneously with the last group the four Ārātīya Yatis who had partial knowledge of parts of the canon and who were named as Vinayadhara, Śrīdhara, Śivadatta and Arhadatta, are said to have lived.

This genealogy has been preserved in the *Tiloya-paṇṇati* (*c.* A.D. 176), the *Jambudvīpa-prajñapti-saṁgraha* (*c.* A.D. 700), the *Dhavala* (A.D. 780), the *Harivaṁśa* (A.D. 783), the *Jayadhavala* (A.D. 837), the *Uttarapurāṇa* (A.D. 898), the *Trilokasāra* (A.D. 973), the *Śrutāvatāras* (*c.* A.D. 950-1250), the several *Paṭṭāvalis* of the Nandi, Sena, Kāṣṭhā Saṁghas, etc., and some other works as also in a number of inscriptions, particularly at Śravaṇa Belgola, belonging to early mediaeval times.

All these sources are in perfect agreement as to the fact that this succession lasted till 683 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*, that up to this time the direct canonical knowledge, though gradually declining in volume, continued to be preserved in the memory of these gurus and that it was about this time that the redaction of the surviving canonical knowledge was undertaken and the Jaina canons for the first time appeared in book form.

There are slight differences as to certain names or their spellings, in some sources one or two names are omitted and in some others a few names are inter-

changed and their order reversed. Some sources also differ as regards the extent of knowledge preserved by groups V and VI. All the sources generally stop at the 28th guru (i.e., Lohācārya), divide these 28 gurus into the five groups as shown in the genealogy, give the total period of each group and make the grand total equal to 683 years. But the *Paṭṭāvalis* of the Nandi Saṁgha, particularly its Prākṛt *Paṭṭāvali* which is quite an old document, gives the total period for the 5 gurus of group IV as 123 years whereas the other sources give it as 220 or 222 years, and while this *Paṭṭāvali* allots 99 years to group V, they allot 118 years to it. Some of the sources place the gurus of group VI simultaneously with group V, some place them soon after M.E. 683 and some others are vague on this point. The said *Paṭṭāvali* is also unique in this respect that it gives separate years for individual gurus as well, which fact also indicates the possibility of its being more correct. Hence in the pontifical genealogy given above this Prākṛt *Paṭṭāvali* of the Nandi Saṁgha has been taken as the standard. A manuscript of the *Paṭṭāvali* is preserved in the Central Jaina Oriental Library, Arrah, and it has also been published (*JSB*, I. 4, pp. 7-74).

THE ŚVETAMBARA TRADITION :—

1.	Gautama	12	years	Total of 62 years for the 3 Kevalins.
2.	Sudharmā	8	,,	
3.	Jambu	42	,,	
4.	Prabhava	11	,,	Total of 116 years for the 5 Śrutakevalins.
5.	Svayambhava	23	,,	
6.	Yaśobhadra	50	,,	
7.	Sambhūtavijaya	8	,,	
8.	Bhadrabāhu	24	,,	

9.	Sthūlabhadra	M.E. 170-215. Last Caturdaśapūrvī.
10.	Ārya Mahāgiri	M.E. 215-46
11.	Ārya Suhasti	M.E. 245-91
12.	Supra or Susthita	M.E. 291-319
13.	Indradinna or Kālaka I	M.E. 325
14.	Priyagrantha	
15.	Vṛddhavādi	
16.	Dinnasūri, Kālaka II	M.E. 453
17.	Siṁhagiri	
18.	Vajrasvāmi—last Daśapūrvī, died in M.E. 598.	
19.	Vajrasena—in his time the schism was finalised (M.E. 609).	

This genealogy is preserved in a number of Śvetāmbara *Paṭṭāvalis* relating to their different Saṁghas and Gacchas and in several other works like the *Kalpa-sūtra Therāvali*, Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭa-parvan*, Merutunga's *Therāvali* and *Prabhāvaka-carita*. The more important *Paṭṭāvalis* have been collected and published by Muni Darśanavijaya in the *Paṭṭāvali-samuccaya*. There are numerous discrepancies in these sources, particularly as regards the dates of these gurus. Whatever is given above is the generally accepted view.

CHRONOLOGY

(100 B.C.—A.D. 900)

527 B.C.—Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* and the commencement of Mahāvīra Era.

c. 150 B.C.—The Council of Jaina monks convened by Khāravela at the Kumārī Parvata in Orissa, beginnings of the Sarasvatī movement.

74 B.C. (M.E. 453)—Kālaka II.

74-61 B.C.—Gardabhilla Mahendrāditya, king of Ujjayinī

66 B.C. (M.E. 461)—First entry of the Śakas into the Ujjayinī region,and the commencement of the Earlier Śaka Era.

61 B.C.—Final defeat and expulsion of Gardabhilla from Ujjayinī at the hands of the Śakas.

57 B.C. (M.E. 470)—Expulsion of the Śakas by the Mālava people under Vikrama. Commencement of the era known as Kṛta, Mālava or Vikrama.

*53 B.C.—Mathura Jaina inscription of Year 4 (*EI*, II. 201).

*52 B.C.— —do— Year 5 (*EI*, III. 12).

*39 B.C.— —do— Year 18 (*EI*, III. 14).

37-14 B.C.—Bhadrabāhu II, the great Jaina pontiff, 27th successor of Mahāvīra, and guru of Kundakunda.

*32 B.C.—Mathura Jaina image inscription, gift by a lady named Vasu, of year 25 (*EI*, I. 384; *IA*, XXX. 37-38).

26 B.C.—Mathura Jaina image Sarvatobhadrikā of year 40 E.S.E. (*EI*, I. 387).

24 B.C.—Mathura Lion Capital inscription of Mahākṣatrapa Rajjubala and Soḍāsa of year 42 E.S.E. and the Inscription of Maues of year 42.

---

* Buhler has interpreted the dates of these inscriptions in terms of V. E. of 57 B. C. But if they were dated in the E. S. E. of 66 B. C., as is likely, the dates would be pushed backwards by 8 years.

17 B.C.—Mathura Jaina Vodva Stūpa inscription of year 49 E.S.E. (*EI*, X, App. No. 47).

14 B.C.—A.D. 38—Lohācārya, the last of the Ācārāṅgadhārīs and original founder of the Kāṣṭhā Saṁgha.

8 B.C.—A.D. 44—Kundakunda, the greatest leader of the Mūla Saṁgha in the South, and his works including *Mūlācāra* and the Tamil *Kurala*.

c. A.D. 1—21—Svāmi Kumāra, the author of *Kārttikeyānuprekṣā*, the Kumāranandi of Mathura inscription of year 87 E.S.E. (*EI*, X, App. No. 7) and a guru of Kundakunda.

c. A.D. 1—50—Śivārya and his *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā*.

A.D. 3 (M E. 530)—Vimalasūri and his *Paum-cariu*.

A.D. 6—Mathura Jaina Votive Tablet Inscription of the time of Mahākṣatrapa Soḍāsa of year 72 (*EI*, X, App. No 59); also inscriptions of Taxila Satraps Liaka and Patika of the same year.

A.D. 12—Taxila Copperplate of Kṣatrapa Patika in the reign of Mahāraya Mogā of year 78.

c. A.D. 25—Gunadhara and his redaction of *Kaṣāya-pāhuda*, part of the Digambara canon.

A.D 26—Mathura image of Vardhamāna insc. of year 92 (*IA*, XVI. 1, p. 13).

A.D. 26-66—Nahapāna, the Śaka Ksaharāta and Nahavāna, Nabhovāhana or Naravāhana of Jaina tradition.

A.D. 37—Takht-i-bahi Insc. of Gondophernes of year 103.

A.D. 38-66—Arhadbali, the leader of the South Indian Jaina congregation.

c. A.D. 40-96—Umāsvāmin and his *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*.

c. A.D. 40-75—Dharasena, the redactor of the *Mahākarma-prakṛti-pāhuda*, part of the Digambara canon.

c. A.D. 50—Āryamankhu associated with the redaction of the *Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa*.

c. A.D. 50-80—Puṣpadanta, the author of the first part of the *Ṣaṭa-khaṇḍāgama* in the form of which the canon redacted by Dharasena was reduced to writing.

A.D. 56—Inscription of Mahārāja Guṣana (Kujula Kadphises) of year 122 E.S.E. (the Panjtar Insc.).

A.D. 57-71 (M.E. 584-98)—Vajrasvāmi, the last Daśapūrvī of Śvetāmbara tradition.

A.D. 66—The great assembly of Jaina monks of South India at Mahimānagarī on the river Venyā under the chairmanship of Arhadbali; the division of the Mūla Saṁgha into Nandi, Deva, Sena, Siṁha, etc.; the Council sent Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali to Dharasena at Girinagara in order to take part in the redaction of the canon.

c. A.D. 66-90—Bhūtabali, the author of *Ṣaṭakhaṇḍāgama-siddhānta*.

A.D. 68—Kalawan Copperplate insc. of year 134 (*EI*, XXI, p. 259).

A.D. 70—Insc. of Wima Kadphises of year 136 (Chir stupa or Taxila silver scroll insc. —*EI*, XXI, p. 295).

A.D. 73 (M.E. 600)—Dharasena wrote the *Joni-pāhuḍa*, a work on Mantraśāstra.

c. A.D. 75—Completion of the *Ṣaṭakhandāgama* by Bhūtabali.

A.D. 78 (M.E. 605)—Bhadra-Caṣṭanas come into power, occupy Ujjayinī and start the Śaka Era; Caṣṭana, the first king of the Western Ksatrapa line of Surāṣṭra; accession of Kaniṣka.

A.D. 79 (V.E. 136)—Origin of the Śvetāmbara sect at Valabhī in Surāṣṭra; the finalisation of the schism between the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras.

A.D. 82 (M.E. 609)—Origin of the Boṭikas (Digambaras) at Rahavīrapura, according to the Śvetāmbara tradition.

A.D. 83—Mathura Jaina image of Vardhamāna insc. of year 5 of Kaniṣka (*EI*, X, App. 18).

A.D. 84—Mathura image of Sumatinātha insc. of year 6 (*JA*, XVI. 1, p. 13).

A.D. 85—Mathura image of Vardhamāna insc. of year 7 of Kaniṣka's reign (*EI*, X, App. No. 21).

A.D. 87—Mathura image of Vardhamāna of Kaniṣka's reign of year 9, mentions a number of Jaina nuns (*EI*, X, App. No. 20).

91 A.D. (V.E. 148)—Foundation of the Yāpanīya Saṁgha by Śrī-kalaśa, according to the *Darśanasāra*.

A.D. 94-162—Nāgahasti, connected with Āryamaṅkhu and Yati-vṛṣabha in the tradition relating to the redaction of the *Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa*.

A.D. 95—Mathura Jaina image insc. of Kaniṣka's times, of year 17 (*JA*, XVI. 1, pp. 14-15).

c. A.D. 100—Kundakīrti, a disciple of Kundakunda and the first commentator of the redacted canon.

c. A.D. 100-150—Balākapiccha, the guru of Samantabhadra.

A.D. 104—A Jaina guru from Rādhā (Bengal) set up an image at Mathura (*JSB*, IV. 3, p. 152).

A.D. 106—Mathura Jaina image of Vardhamāna insc. of year 28 of Huviṣka's reign. (*EI*, X, App.).

A.D. 107—Two Mathura Jaina inscriptions of year 29 (ibid.).

A.D. 116—Mathura Jaina Elephant Capital (Nāndīviśāla) set up by Śreṣthī Rudradāsa in year 38, in Huviska's reign (*EI*, X, App. No. 41).

c. A.D. 120—Birth of Samantabhadra as prince Śāntivarman, the son of Kīlikavarma Cola at Uraiyur in the Phaṇimaṇḍala of south-east coast.

A.D. 122—Mathura Jaina image insc. of year 44 of Huviṣka's reign (*EI*, X, App.).

A.D. 125—Taxila Duckvase insc. of Jihoṇika of year 191 (*CII*, II No. XXX, p. 81).

A.D. 126—Two Mathura Jaina image inscriptions of year 48 of Huviṣka's reign (ibid.).

c. A.D. 130-80—Yativṛṣabha, the first commentator of the *Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa* and the original author of the *Tiloyapaṇṇati-sutta*.

A.D. 130—Mathura Jaina image of Vardhamāna insc. of year 52 mentions Ārya Nāgahasti (*EI*, X, App. 53).

A.D. 132—Installation of an image of Sarasvatī at Mathura in the year 54 (ibid., 54).

A.D. 138—Mathura Jaina image of Ṛṣabha insc. of year 60 in the reign of Huviṣka (ibid, 56).

c. A.D. 140-85—Svāmi Samantabhadra as saint, scholar and author.

c. A.D. 150—Śivaskandaśrī alias Śivakoti, the second king of the Kadamba dynasty of Karhad, devotee of Samantabhadra, abdicated in favour of his son Śrīkaṇṭha and became a Jaina monk with his brother Śivāyana. He wrote *Ratnamālā*, probably the first commentary on the *Tattvārtha* of Umāsvāmi.

c. A.D. 150—Candraguhā Jaina insc. of Girinagara (Junagarh) of Mahākṣatrapa Dāmajadśrī (*EI*, X, App. II, 966); Kāṇabhikṣu, the first writer of stories in Prākrt.

A.D. 152—Mathura Jaina stone slab insc. of year 74 of the reign of Vasudeva (*EI*, X, App. 60).

A.D. 156 (M.E. 683)—The line of Mahāvīra's successors who retained in memory the original canonical knowledge and depended only on oral transmission thereof, came to an end. The Sarasvatī movement was now an accomplished fact.

A.D. 158—Mathura Jaina image insc. of year 80 of Vasudeva's reign (*EI*, X, App.).

A.D. 160—Mathura Vardhamāna insc. of year 82 (*JA*, XIII. 2, p. 10).

A.D. 161—Mathura insc. of year 83 of Jainadāsī, in the reign of Mahārāja Vasudeva (*IA*, XXX, 107).

A.D. 162—Mathura insc. of year 84 in the reign of Vasudeva mentions Kumāraka and Ganikagutta (*EI*, X, App. 1373).

A.D. 165—Mathura insc. of year 87 in the reign of Vasudeva (*EI*, X, App.).

A.D. 176—Mathura insc. of year 98 in the reign of Vasudeva mentions Ganī Ārya Devadatta (ibid.); completion by Yativṛsabha of the original *Tiloyapaṇṇati-sutta*; end of the 242 years' rule of the Śaka dynasty which had started in 66 B.C.

c. A.D. 175-200—Phanimandala of the south-east coast changed into Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and the Pallava kingdom of Kāñcī founded.

A.D. 181—Last known date of Nāgārjuna, the Buddhist scholar and a contemporary of Samantabhadra.

A.D. 188—Jaina guru Simhanandi helped the brothers Daddiga and Mādhava in founding the kingdom of Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000 (Rice, *My. & Cg.*, pp. 32, 49; *MJ*, p. 7, f.n. 1).

A.D. 189-250—Mādhava Koṅguṇivarma I, the first king of the Western line of the Gaṅgas of Talkad (ibid.). He is also known to have issued a copperplate grant (cf., *MAR*, for 1912-13, pp. 33-34).

c. A.D. 200-250—Uccāraṇācārya wrote a *Vṛtti* on Yativṛṣabha's *Cūrṇīs* on the *Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa*; Śāmakuṇḍa wrote a commentary on the canon; Śvetāmbara scholar Pādalipta Sūri, his association with the Muruṇḍas of Pāṭaliputra, and the devastation of that city by floods, etc.; Mānadeva wrote a *Śāntistava* to bring peace to the city of Taxila afflicted by the onslaughts of the Tukharians.

A.D. 233—Mathura Jaina inscription of year 299 E.S.E., recording the setting up of Mahāvīra's temple by Śarika and Śivadinā, in the reign of an unknown Mahārāja-rājātirāja (*EI*, X, App. No. 78).

c. A.D. 250-275—Bappadeva, a commentator of the canons, and probably the spiritual preceptor of the Pallava king Śivaskandavarman.

A.D. 300-313 (M.E. 827-40)—Ārya Skandila convened at Mathura a council of the Śvetāmbara monks to consider the question of the redaction of the canon. Simultaneously Nāgārjuna Sūri held another council at Valabhī for the same purpose.

c. A D. 300-350—Kūcī Bhaṭṭāraka and Nandimuni, two early Jaina Purāṇakāras. The latter of the two was the teacher of the Ganga kings ruling over the southern country (cf., *MAR*, 1923, p. 115).

A.D. 319-20—Commencement of the Gupta (or Valabhī) era.

A.D. 339 (S.E. 261)—Jaina temple built at Kummuḍavāḍa. The insc. mentions the gurus Gunakīrti, Nāgacandra, Jinacandra, Śubhakīrti and Devakīrti (*JSB*, IV. 1, Guerinot).

A.D. 345-425—Dinnāga, the great Buddhist scholar, and his *Pramāna-samuccaya.*

A.D. 370—Matur-Nonmangala copperplate grant of Tadaṅgāla Mādhava Gaṅga for an Arhat temple to Ācārya Vīradeva, in the 13th regnal year of that king (*EC*, X. 73, pp. 172-73).

c. A.D. 370—Sonabhanḍāra Jaina Cave (Rajgir, Bihar) insc. records excavation of two caves containing images of Arhat for Tapas-

vināḥ for the attainment of *nirvāṇa*, by the jewel among Ācāryas, Muni Vīradeva (*EI*, X, App., 959).

A.D. 400 (G.E. 80)—Halsi grant of Kākutsthavarman Kadamba to Jaina Śrutakīrti Bhojaka (*IA*, IV, pp. 24-27); Buddhist Vasubandhu and his *Abhidharmakoṣa*.

c. A.D. 400—Kavi Parameśvara and his *Vāgārtha-saṁgraha*, the first Jaina *Mahāpurāṇa*.

c. A.D. 400-25—Siddhasena Kṣapanaka, contemporary of Candragupta II Vikramāditya, and of poet Kālidāsa; the early *Dvātriṁśikās*; Yaśobhadra, Prabhācandra and Śrīdatta (author of *Jalpanirṇaya*) mentioned in the *Jainendra*.

c. A.D. 425—Śarvavarma, the author of the *Kammapaidi* and the *Śataka*, and probably of the *Kātantra* grammar.

A.D. 425 (G.E. 106)—Udayagiri (Bhilsa) Jaina cave insc. records the installation of an image of Pārśvanātha by Śankara Muni, a disciple of Gośarma of the lineage of Bhadrabāhu (*Gupta Inscs.*, p. 258).

A.D. 430-82—Gaṅga King Avinīta Konguni, a Jaina monarch and a sister's son of Kṛṣṇavarma I Kadamba.

A.D. 430—Avinīta's Nonmangala copperplate grant to his guru Vijayakīrti for the Uranur Arhat temple founded by Candranandi and others of the Mūla Saṁgha (*EC*, X, Mr. 72).

A.D. 432 (G.E. 113)—Mathura Jaina image insc. mentions Dhartilācārya (*EI*, II, 210).

A.D. 432-73—The 42 years' tyrannical rule of the Kalki, according to Jaina tradition. He was probably the barbarous chief of the White Huns who commenced his inroads in the reigns of Kumāragupta I and Skandagupta.

A.D. 442—Hasakote copperplate grant of Avinīta to an Arhatāyatana issued in his 12th year, mentions the name of the mother of Siṁhavarma Pallavādhirāja (*MAR*, 1938, 1).

A.D. 453-66 (M.E. 980-993)—Devardhigaṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa, the council of Valabhī and the redaction of the Śvetāmbara canon.

A.D. 458 (S.E. 380)—Sarvanandi wrote his Prākṛt *Lokavibhāga* in the 22nd year of Pallava Siṁhavarma, lord of Kāñcī.

A.D. 460 (G.E. 141)—Kahaum (Gorakhpur) Jaina pillar with the

image of Pañcajinendra (*Gupta Inscs.*, No. 15).

A.D. 464-524—Pūjyapāda Devanandi, author of the *Jainendra* grammar and other works, teacher and spiritual preceptor of Durvinīta Gaṅga.

c. A.D. 465-555—Bhāravi the poet, contemporary of Durvinīta Gaṅga, Viṣṇuvardhana Cālukya and Siṁhaviṣṇu Pallava.

c. A.D. 470-78—Mṛgeśa Varman Kadamba, a Jaina monarch whose several copperplate grants speak of his building Jaina temples and of donations for the benefit of the Digambara and Śvetāmbara ascetics. Therein we find the first mention of the Śvetāmbara Saṁgha and also of the Kūrcakas, a sub-sect of the Digambaras. The principal donee is Dāmakīrti Bhojaka (*IA*, VI, VII)

A.D. 473 (V.E. 531)—An inscription mentions guru Vīranandi of Balātkāragaṇa (*JA*, IV, 3, p 82).

c. A.D. 474-515—Hūna king Toramāna ruled from Pavaiyā on the Candrabhāgā He was a royal pupil of Harigupta and was probably identical with the benevolent son of the traditional Kalki.

A.D. 478-513—Ravivarman Kadamba, a devoted Jaina. His several copperplate grants speak of his pious acts, of the Jaina festival of Aṣṭānhikā, of the Cāturmāsa Yoga of Jaina ascetics, of donations to Jaina temples, etc. His principal donee was Bandhusena, the son of Dāmakīrti Bhojaka; Munis Haridatta and Kumāradatta (*IA*, VI); the King's brother Bhānuvarma also gave a grant to Bhojaka Pandara for the ablution ceremony of Jinendra on every full moon (ibid).

A.D. 479 (G E. 159)—Pahārpur (Bengal) Jaina insc. records a grant by a Brahmin family to the Jaina pontiff of Vaṭagohālī establishment, who belonged to the line of Guhanandi of the Pañcastūpa-nikāya and a resident of Kāśī (*EI*, XX, pp. 61-64).

A.D. 482-522—Ganga king Durvinīta Koṅguṇi, pupil of Pūjyapāda Devanandi and patron of poet Bhāravi, issued several copperplate grants (cf., *MAR*, for 1912, 1926; *EC*, XII; the *Avantīsundarī Kathāsāra*).

A.D. 505 (S.E. 427)—The *Pañca-siddhāntikā* of Varāhamihira.

A.D. 513-38—Harivarma Kadamba, a devout Jaina. His copper-plate grants in the 4th and 5th regnal years speak of donations to Jaina temples and gurus and for other purposes prescribed by Jainism. The records show that his uncle Śivaratha, a cousin of Kṛṣṇavarma II, with his son, prince Devavarma, and his friend the Saindraka king Bhānuśakti, was devoted to Jainism. Among the donees, Vāriṣenācārya of the Kūrcaka Saṁgha is mentioned (*IA*, VI & VII).

A.D. 522—Gummareddipur copperplate of Durvinīta of his 40th year (*MAR*, 1926, p. 7).

c. A.D. 525-50—Bhadrabāhu III and his *Niryuktis* He was a brother of Varāhamihira, the astronomer.

A.D. 532-33 (V.E. 589)—Mandasore insc. of Yaśodharman of Malwa, the rival of Mihirakula Hūna.

A.D. 549 (S.E. 471) (?)—Altem insc. of Cālukya Pulakeśin I who at the request of his feudatory Sāmiyāra of the Saindraka family gave grant for a Jaina temple to Jinanandi, a disciple of Nāgadeva and grand-disciple of Siddhanandi Citakacārya of the Kakopala line (*IA*, VII, No. 44, pp. 209-217).

c. A.D. 550—Gunanandi and his *Jainendraprakriyā*, Muskara Ganga, the successor of Durvinīta Ganga, built Muṣkara Basadi near Bellary (*Gangas of Talkad*, p. 45); Rājarṣi Devagupta, a later Gupta King, became a Jaina monk whose guru was Harigupta, also of the Gupta family, poet Subandhu and his *Vāsavadattā*.

c. A.D. 550-600—Siddhasena Divākara and his *Sanmati-sutta*.

A.D. 560—The *Kṣetrasamāsa*, a work on mathematics by Jinabhadragani (*JA*, II. 2, p. 49).

A.D. 567—Cālukya Kīrtivarman I gave grant to a Jaina temple (*JSB*, IV. 1, p. 32; Guerinot).

c. A.D 575—Vakragrīva and his *Navaśabdavācya*.

c. A.D. 575-625—Pātrakesari and his *Trilakṣana Kadarthana*.

A.D. 582-604—Vajranandi and his *Navastotra*.

A.D. 585 (S.E. 507)—Ravikīrti built a temple at Aihole (*JSB*, IV. 1, p. 31; Guerinot).

A.D. 587 (S.E. 509)—Death of astronomer Varāhamihira (Smith, *Ox. Hist. Ind.*, p. 160).

A.D. 590-650—Bhartrhari and his *Vākyapadīya* (*NKC*, Introduction).

c. A.D. 600—Mallavādī and his *Dvādaśāranayacakra*; Saṃghadāsagaṇi and his *Vasudevahiṇḍi* and *Vṛhat Kalpabhāṣya*; Sumatideva and his *Ṭīkā* on *Sanmati-sutta*; Mānatunga and his *Bhaktāmara-stotra*; Approximate date of the Tamil classic, *Pattinapalai*, *Silappadikāram* and *Manimekalai*.

A.D. 600-25—Poet Śrīvardhadeva, contemporary of poet Daṇḍī, and his *Cūdāmani*.

A.D. 600-60—Kumārila Bhatta, the Mīmāṃsaka scholar.

A.D. 604 (S.E. 526)—Foundation of the Dramila Saṃgha at Madura by Vajranandi and others. The great age of Tamil literary activity.

A.D. 606-47—King Harsavardhana of Kannauj; poet Bāṇa and his Jaina friend Vīradeva Ksapanaka.

A.D. 608-42—Pulakeśin II, the Western Cālukya emperor of Badāmī.

A.D. 609 (S.E. 531)—Jinabhadra Ksamāśramana completed his *Viśesāvaśyaka-bhāsya* at Valabhī in the reign of Maitraka king Śiladitya I.

c. A.D. 610—Mahendravarman I, the Pallava king of Kāñcī, patronized Jainism; Jaina caves of Sittanavassal with fresco paintings (Smith, *EHI*, p. 472).

A.D. 619—King Śaśānka of Bengal.

A.D. 623 (V.E. 680)—Śaṅkaragana, the Kalacuri king of Cedi, founded the Jaina centre of Kulpāka (*JA*, XII. 1, p. 45).

A.D. 625-675—Akalaṅka, the great logician.

A.D. 629-44—Hiuen Tsang, the Chinese pilgrim, visited India.

A.D. 634 (S.E. 556)—Aihole insc. of Pulakeśin II, grant to Ravikīrti, the author of the insc., for a Jaina temple, mentions Kālidāsa and Bhāravi (*EI*, VI, p. 4); Adur (Dharwar) insc. of a Cālukya king, recording a grant to a Jaina temple built by the Nagarasetha (*EI*, VI, p. 46).

A.D. 634-35—Bednur grant of Bhūvikrama Ganga, mentions his feudatory Bāna king Vikramāditya Govinda Sacīndra who was a devout Jaina (*MAR*, 1925, pp. 85, 87).

A.D. 642-80—Vikramāditya I, the Western Cālukya emperor of Badāmī, King Sāhasatunga of the Akalanka tradition and the patron of that guru.

A.D. 643—The All-religions Conference held by Harsa.

A.D. 643 (V.E. 700)—Akalanka's great disputation with and victory over the Mahāyānist Buddhist scholars at Ratnapur in the country of Kalinga, in the court of king Himasītala of Trikalinga.

c. A.D. 650—Jaina caves at Dabarwali or the Torna Lena (Burgess, *ASMI*, III, p 2), Jaina astronomers Gargācārya and Rsiputra; an insc. mentions Kanakasena, the guru of Baladeva Muni (*EC*, II. 2, p. 2); Vrsabhanandi of Pañcastūpanvaya mentioned in a Śravana Belgola insc. of s r. 572 (*EC*, II. 75, pp. 38, 40-41).

c. A.D. 655—Persecution of the Jainas in the Pāndyan country by King Sundara or Nendumarana Pāndya under the influence of Śaiva Sambandara (*EHI*, pp 454-58)

A.D 670-713—Śivamāra I Navakāma, the Ganga king, built Jaina temples and gave grant to Jaina guru Candrasena Ācārya (*MAR*, 1925, pp. 91-92) and wrote the *Gajaśāstra*, a treatise on elephants.

A.D. 673 (V E 730)—Svātisūri, a Śvetāmbara pontiff (*Bhandarkar's Rep.*, 1883-84, p 323).

c. A.D 675-700—Joindu, the Jaina mystic and Apabhramśa poet; Jatāsimhanandi and his *Varānga-carita*, Mahāsena and his *Sulocanā-kathā*.

A.D 676 (M.E. 1203)—Ravisena and his *Padma-carita*.

A.D. 676 (S.E. 598)—Jinadāsagani Mahattara and his *Cūrnīs* on the Śvetāmbara *Āgamas*.

A.D. 681-97—Vinayāditya Cālukya and his spiritual minister Nirvadya Pandita who was a house-pupil of Pūjyapāda Akalanka of Devagana.

A.D. 686-87 (V. E. 608)—His grant to that guru (*IA*, VII, p. 112).

A.D. 687 (V.E. 744)—The two inscribed Jaina metal images from Vasantagarh (Ojha, *Sirohi*, pp. 31-32).

A.D. 697-733—Cālukya Vijayāditya and his grants to the Jaina gurus who were disciples of Akalanka.

c. A.D. 700—Hirematha copperplate grant of the Gangas refers to Durvinīta and his guru Pūjyapāda Devanandi (*EC*, XII, Trns. 23, p. 7).

A.D. 700—A Nandi Muni is mentioned in an insc. (*EC*, II, III p. 45), a Jaina insc. mentions Gandhavarman, Śrīsamgha and Śrīpurānvaya (*EC*, II, p. 46), three Jaina inscriptions at Śravana Belgola and one at Badānī, the first ones in the Kannada language (*IA*, X, p. 61), Gunasena, the disciple of Muni Guruvara of Agali, died (*EC*, II. 8, p 3).

c. A.D. 700—Padmanandi wrote his Prākrt *Jambudvīpa-prajñapti-samgraha* at Bārā which was then being ruled by Satti Bhūpāla; Aparājita Sūri alias Srīvijaya and his *Vijayodayā-tīkā*; Kumāranandi and his *Vādanyāya*, Jinasena I, the author of the *Vardhamāna-purāna*, Dhanañjaya, the Jaina poet, and his works, Halegiri insc. of Cālukya Vijayāditya mentions Koppana Tīrtha (*KHR*, II. 1, p 48).

c. A.D. 700-50—Siddhasena III and his *Nyāyāvatāra*, Āryanandi of Pañcastūpanvaya, the guru of Svāmi Vīrasena, Elācārya of Citrakūtapura, the teacher of Vīrasena in Siddhānta.

A.D. 710-90—Svāmi Vīrasena and his famous commentaries on the Digambara canonical works.

A.D. 713-26—Ganga king Rācamalla Areganga.

A.D. 723 (M.E. 1250)—Svetāmbara Dinnaginna Sūri The *Bhagavatī* and the six *Angas* in their original form are said to have been lost at this time (*PR*, III, App. 22)

c. A.D. 725—Caturmukha, the great Apabhramśa poet, Vrhat Anantavīrya, the first known commentator of Akalanka.

A.D. 725-50—Dharmottara and his *Tippana* on Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu*.

c. A.D. 725-825—Haribhadra Sūri, the son of Yākinī, a great Śvetāmbara scholar and author.

c. A.D. 725-50—Vimalacandra alias Vādisiṁha, a protegé of Śrīpuruṣa Gaṅga and instructor in politics to the Nirguṇḍa chief.

A.D. 726-776—Ganga king Śrīpurusa Muttarasa, a great Jaina monarch, the Śatrubhayankara of Vimalacandra's tradition.

A.D. 729 (S E. 651)—Lakṣmeśvara insc. of Cālukya Vijayāditya, grant to the disciples of Akalanka (*IA*, XII, p. 112).

A.D. 733—In the same reign one Vikkīrnaka gave grant to the Śaṅkha Jinālaya of Purigere (*MER*, 1936, E. 34).

A.D. 733-46—Cālukya Vikramāditya II, gave grants to Jaina temples and gurus of Akalanka's line (*JA*, XIII, p. 33)

A.D. 735—Cālukya Vikramāditya's grant to Śankha Jinālaya (*IA*, XXX, p. 106).

A.D. 743 (V.E 800)—Bappabhaṭṭa Sūri, the spiritual adviser of King Amma of Kannauj.

A.D. 746—Vanarāja Chāvdā with the blessings of a Jaina monk founded Annhilapura Pattana and built a temple of Pārśva in that city (*BG*, I. 2).

A.D. 749—Buddhist Śāntaraksita in his *Tattvasaṁgraha-kārikā*, criticised Jaina doctrines (*Hist Ind. Logic*, p. 125).

c. A.D. 750—Revival of the literary activity of the Jainas in Tamil countries when some of the best works in that language were produced, Siddhasenagani, the first Śvetāmbara commentator of the *Tattvārtha* of Umāsvāmi, Anantakīrti I and his *Prāmānya-bhanga*; a Vallamalli record in Kannada and Grantha characters mentions the setting up of an image of Devasena, the disciple of Bhānunandi and the guru of a Bāna king, by Ajjanandi (*MER*, insc. Nos. 7 & 8 of 1895, *Top. List*, I, p. 120).

A.D. 750—Restoration of a Jaina temple at Chikkaballapura (*EC*, X, 29); the Prabhācandra Epitaph at Śravana Belgola (*EI*, IV. 2).

A.D. 750-800—Kumārasena Guru or Vrddha Kumārasena.

A.D. 750-805—Prabhācandra of the Rāstrakūṭa inscs.

A.D. 756-73—Rāṣtrakūṭa Krsna I Śubhatunga and the Ellora cave temples.

A.D. 762 (S.E. 684)—Eastern Cālukya Visnuvardhana III of Vengī, mentioned in a grant to Jaina Kalibhadrācārya. Queen Ayyanna Mahādevī renewed an earlier grant (*SSIJ*, p. 67; *Ep. R. S. Circle*, 1917-18, p. 116).

A.D. 764-99—Eastern Cālukya Visnuvardhana IV, the patron of Ugrāditya.

c. A.D. 770-800—Parvādimalla or Mallavādī II, a grand-disciple of Vimalacandra, patronised by Rāstrakūta Krsna I. He wrote a commentary on Dharmottara's *Tippana* on the *Nyāyabindu.*

c. A.D. 770-840—Ugrāditya and his *Kalyānakāraka* (*c.* A.D. 800).

c. A.D. 770-850—Jinasena Svāmi of the Sena Samgha, disciple of Vīrasena, preceptor of Amoghavarsa I, and the author of the *Pārśvābhyudaya*, the *Ādipurāna*, etc.

A.D. 772 (V.E. 829)—Foundation of the Tomara dynasty at Delhi, the first king being Jāju (*Rājāvali* of Delhi, *JSB*, IV. 4, p. 249).

A.D. 773-78—Rāstrakūta Govinda II

A.D. 775-825—Vidyānandi, the great logician, and his works, contemporary of Śankara and Sureśvara and patronised by several Ganga kings.

A.D. 775-95—Svayambhū, the great Apabharamśa poet, and his *Rāmāyana*, his patrons Dhanañjaya, the royal banker of Kannauj and Rāṣtrakūta Dhruva Dhārāvarsa.

A.D. 776—Devarahalli plates of the Ganga king Śrīpurusa, granting villages in the Nirgund country at the instance of Kandacci, a Nirgund queen, for the Lokatilaka temple built by her, mentions Candranandi, Kumāranandi, Kīrtinandi, Vimalacandra, etc., of the Mūla Nandi Samgha, Eregittura Gana, Pulikala Gaccha (*EC*, IV, Ng. 85, p. 135); Narasimhapura plates of Śrīpurusa to Jaina temple of Tolla (*MAR*, 1920, p 28)

A.D. 776 (S E 698)—Copperplate grant of Śrīpurusa Ganga for Jaina temple of Śrīpura (Guerinot, No. 121), Vidyānandi composed his *Śrīpura Pārśvanātha Stotra.*

A.D. 777—Śrīpurusa retired and abdicated in favour of his son Śivamāra II, a patron of Vidyānandi.

A.D. 778 (S.E. 699)—Udyotana Sūrī alias Dākṣinya Cinha, a grandson of the ruler of Mahādvārā, the disciple of Ravibhadra and a pupil of Haribhadra, wrote his *Kuvalayamālā* in the Rsabhadeva temple at Jābālipur, in the reign of Vatsarāja, the Gurjara-Pratihāra king of Bhinnamāla.

A.D. 779-93—Rāstrakūta emperor Dhruva Dhārāvarsa Nirupama, the Śrīvallabha of Jinasena, the Boddana Rāya of Vīrasena and the Dhavalaiya of Svayambhū. His son Govinda III Jagatuṅga was heir-designate and ruled as viceroy of Nāsikadeśa and Mayūrakhandī region.

A.D. 780 (V.E. 838)—Date of the completion of the *Dhavala* by Vīrasena at Vātagrāma under the viceroyalty of Jagatungadeva and in the reign of Dhruva Dhārāvarsa

A.D. 781—Nārāyanadevī, a celebrated Jaina lady, wife of the minister Nināga at Śrīpattana (*Bhandarkar Rep.*, 1883-84, p. 322)

A.D. 783—Jinasena Sūri Punnāta wrote his *Harivamśa-purāna* in the Pārśvanātha temple of the Nannaraja Basati at Vardhamānapura and in the Śāntinātha temple of the near-by Dostatikā, when Indrāyudha was ruling in Kannauj, Dhruva Śrīvallabha in the Deccan, Vatsarāja in Marwar, King of Avanti in Malwa and Jayavīra Varāha in Souramandala.

A.D. 784—Vatsarāja, the Gurjara-Pratihāra of Bhinnamāla, is said to have built a Jaina temple at Osia, in an insc. of V.E. 1013 i.e., A.D. 956 (*ASI*, 1906-07, pp. 209-242); Śivamāra Ganga was defeated and imprisoned by Rāstrakūta Dhruva and the latter's son Kambha was appointed viceroy of Gangavādi.

A.D. 788—Buddhists of the Pallava country banished to Ceylon due to persecution by Śankarācārya.

A.D. 788-812—Mārasimha Duggamāra ruled over the Ganga kingdom.

c. A.D. 790—Death of Svāmi Vīrasena.

A.D. 793-814—Rāstrakūta Govinda III Jagatunga Prabhūtavarṣa.

A.D. 795-835—Jaina guru Śripāla; poet Svayambhū turned ascetic.

A.D. 797 (S.E. 719)—Śrīvijaya, a general of Ganga Mārasimha, founded a Jaina temple. Inscription mentions gurus Toranācārya and

Puspanandi-Prabhācandra of Kundakundānvaya (Guerinot No. 122).

A.D. 799—The *Kalyānakāraka* of Ugrāditya; Śrīdhara and his Sanskrit *Jyotirjñānavidhi* (*JSB*, XIV, pp. 31-42).

c. A.D. 800—Āñjaneya temple record of Mārasimha Duggamāra (*MAR*, 1932, pp 241-42), Ganjam plates of the same ruler (*EC*, IV, Sr. 160, p. 143), Jinadattarāi, founder of the Santāra house, the whole line of chiefs devoted to Jainism (cf., *EC*, VII, Sk. 114, p. 37), Nandi Hill boulder insc. The place seems to have been an abode of Kundakunda (*EC*, X, c. 29, pp. 204-05), probable date of the Kannada *Vaddārādhane*; probable date of the *Akalanka-carita* and *Astaka*

A.D 800—Inscriptions recording grants to Jaina temples by governors Vittirasa and Vijayaśaktarasa of Ganga Śivamāra II (*MAR*, 1920, p. 28).

c A D 800-25—Tribhuvana Svayambhū, the Apabhramśa poet, son of Svayambhū.

A.D 801—Jaina stone insc. in Īsvara temple of Basavatti (*MAR*, 1923, p 237).

A D 802 (S.E. 724)—Rāstrakūta Govinda III's Manne plates grants for the Śrīvijaya Basadi of Mānyaour, to the gurus of Udāragana (*EC*, IX, Nl. 61).

A.D. 807—Cāmarājanagara copperplate grant of Kambha who at the request of his son Śankaragana granted villages for the Śrīvijaya Basadi of Tālavannagar to Vardhamāna guru, disciple of Elācārya, the disciple of Kumāranandi of Kundakunda's lineage (*EC*, II. 35, p. 8).

A D. 810—Ganga king Śivamāra II founded the Śivamārana Basadi at Śravana Belgola (*EC*, II. 415, p. 180).

A.D. 812 (S E. 735)—Kadba plates of Govinda III, recording grant for Jaina temple of Silagrama, to Arkakīrti, disciple of Vijayakīrti, the disciple of Kalyānācārya, issued from the fortress of Mayūrakhandī, at the request of the Ganga chief Cākirāja because the guru had warded off the evil influence of Saturn from that chief's sister's son Vimalāditya of the Cālukya family (*IA*, XII, p. 13).

A.D. 815-50—Rācamalla Satyavākya I, a great Ganga king, devoted to Jainism and patron of Vidyānandi, built a Basadi on Vallimalai in Vandwash taluk, N. Arcot dist.

A.D. 815-77—Rāstrakūta emperor Amoghavarsa I, a great patron of Jainism, and the reputed author of the *Kavirājamārga* and the *Praśnottaramālikā*, Bankeya, a great general and a favourite noble of the emperor.

A.D. 821 (S.E 743)—Surat copperplate of Karkarāja I of Gujarat branch, granting land to a grand-disciple of Parvādimalla, for the Jaina establishment of Navasārī (*EI*, XXI, p. 133).

c. A.D. 825—Anantavīrya II, the disciple of Ravibhadra, and a great commentator of Akalanka.

A.D. 833 (V.E. 890)—Death of Nāgāvaloka or Nāgabhatta II of Kannauj, according to the *Prabhāvaka-carita*

A.D. 837 (S.E. 759)—Completion of the *Jayadhavala* at Vātagrāma by Jinasena Svāmi.

c. A.D. 840—Ugrāditya's discourse on the uselessness of meat diet etc., in the court of Amoghavarsa I.

A.D. 848 (V.E. 905)—Rāmasena founded the Māthura Samgha at Mathura (the *Darśanasāra*).

c. A.D. 850—Anantakīrti II and his *Brhat* and *Laghu Sarvajña Siddhis*, Death of Jinasena Svāmi, leaving incomplete his *Ādipurāna*.

c. A.D. 850-75—Śāktāyana Pālyakīrti and his *Sabdānuśāsana* and *Amoghavrtti*.

c. A.D. 850-80—Mahāvīrācārya and his *Ganitasāra-samgraha*.

c. A.D. 850-95—Gunabhadra, the chief disciple of Jinasena, completed the *Ādipurāna* and wrote the *Uttarapurāna* and other works.

A.D. 853-69—Nītimārga I Ereya Ganga, the Ganga king of Talkad, described as 'a bee at the lotus feet of the adorable Arhat Bhattāraka' (*MJ*, p. 26).

A.D. 854—Kangrabazar Jaina image of Pārśvanātha insc. of year 30 in ancient Śāradā characters, mentions Abhayacandra Sūri (*EI*, I. 18, p. 120).

A.D. 856—Jayasimha Sūri and his *Dharmopadeśamālā-vṛtti.*

A.D. 858-76—Śīlānka and his commentaries on the Śvetāmbara *Āgamas.*

A.D. 859 (S.E. 781)—Insc. records grant for a Basadi to Nāganandi Ācārya of Simhavaragana (*MER*, 1934, No. 116).

c. A.D. 860—Trivikrama and his Prākrt grammar.

A.D. 860 (S E. 782)—Kannur insc. of Amoghavarsa I, for Jaina Devendra, issued from Mānyakheta (*EI*, VI. 4, p. 29).

A.D. 861—Ghatiyāla Jaina insc. in Prākrt mentions that the Padihāra king Kakkuka built a Jaina temple and gave it to Dhaneśvara Gaccha (*JSB*, IV. 3, p. 158)

A.D. 862 (V.E 919,S E. 784)—Deogarh Jaina Pillar insc. of the time of Bhojadeva of Kannauj and his feudatory Mahāsāmanta Visnurāma, the governor of Lauecchagiri (Deogarh). Pillar was erected by Jaina guru Śrī Deva, the disciple of Kamaladeva (*EI*, IV, pp. 309-10).

A.D. 871 (S.E. 793)—Kumārasena, disciple of Vinayasena, a colleague of Jinasena, founded the Kāsthā Samgha (the *Darśanasāra*).

A.D. 873 (M.E. 1400)—Śvetāmbara Jyesthabhūti, in whose time the *Kalpavyavahāra-sūtra* was lost (*Peterson Rep*, III, App 22).

A.D. 875 (S.E. 797)—Saundatti insc. records grants of land for a Jaina temple by governor Pirthivirāma, a noble of Rāṣṭrakūta Kṛṣṇa II (*EI*, App. No. 79, Guerinot, No. 130).

A.D. 876 (V.E. 933)—Alur insc. of Vikrama Santāra, a great Jaina chief (*EI*, XVI, p 27).

A.D. 877-914—Rāṣṭrakūta Krsna II Akālavarsa, patron of Jainism. His grants to Jaina Basadi at Mulgunda, Bandnike, etc. (*JBRAS*, X, p. 192, *MAR*, 1911, p 38)

A.D. 878 (S.E. 800)—Pallava Mahendra Nolamba gave grant to Basadi at Tagetur (7 & 8 of 1895, *Top. List*, I, p. 120), Paliyakka Basadi of Humcca built by the Santāra king (*MJ*, p 220).

A.D. 881—A Koppana insc. records the death of Sarvanandi, disciple of Ekkacatugadu Bhatāra (*KHR*, II, p. 13).

A.D. 886-913—The great Kannada poet Gunavarma and his Jaina *Harivamśa.*

A.D. 887 (S.E. 809)—Biliyur stone insc. of Rācamalla Satyavākya II Konguni, granted 12 villages to the Satyavākya Jinālaya of Peynukadanga to Saravanandi disciple of Śivanandi Siddhānta Bhattāraka (*EC*, I. 2).

A.D. 893 (S.E. 815)—Stone insc. mentions that the sons of Maṅgala Sethī, a nobleman in the reign of Mahendra Rāja Nolamba, gave grant to the Basadi at Dharmapuri to Kanakasena, the disciple of Vinayasena of Pogarigana, Senānvaya, Mūla Samgha (304 of 1901, *Top. List*, II, p. 1211, *EI*, X, pp. 54-70), Another insc. mentions Gunasena with Kanakasena (*Top List*, II p. 1003).

A.D. 897—Tolapurusa Vikrama Santāra built a Basadi for Mauni Siddhānta Bhattāraka of Kundakunda's line (*EC*, VIII, Nr. 60, p 154).

A.D 898—Same king built the Guddada Basadi at Humcca and dedicated it to Bāhubali (*MAR*, 1929, p. 7).

A.D. 898 (S E. 820)—Lokasena, the disciple of Gunabhadra, instituted public worship of the latter's *Mahāpurāna* at Bankāpura under his patron Lokāditya.

c. A D. 900—Mandalapurusa, a disciple of Lokasena of the Senagana, is a great name in Tamil literature.

A D 900—Grant of king Vikrama Varaguna in his 28th year, to a disciple of Arittanemi Bhattāra of Perayakudi (*Travancore Manual*, II, pp. 194-95); Cikka Hansoge Basadi record of a Jaina noble lady Jakkiyabbe who was a capable administrator (*MAR*, 1912-13, p. 38).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Jaina Texts.

Akalanka-caritra and *Astaka*, Ed Pannalal Bakliwal

Akalanka-granthatraya, Ed M K Sastri. Ahmedabad, 1939

Akalanka-stotra, Palm-leaf MS. in CJOL, Arrah.

Anekāntajayapatākā of Haribhadra. Baroda, 1940.

Antagadadasāo, English translation by L. D. Barnett. London, 1907.

Astasahasrī of Vidyānandi. Bombay, 1915

Aupapātika-sūtra, Ed E. Leumann Leipzig, 1883.

Ācārānga, Ed W S. Schubring. Leipzig, 1910; Eng. trans. H. Jacobi, *SBE* Oxford, 1892

Ādipurāna of Jinasena, Pt. I. BGP, Kasi, 1951

Āptamīmāmsā of Samantabhadra, Palm-leaf MS in CJOL, Arrah, Bombay, 1905

Āptaparīksā of Vidyānandi VSM, Sarsawa, Banaras, 1913

Āvaśyaka Mūlabhāsya, Āgamodaya Samiti, Bhavnagar

Bhadrabāhu-carita of Ratnanandi. MS.

Bhagavatī-ārādhanā of Śivārya. Solapur, 1935, Ed N R. Premi, Bombay

Bhaktāmara-stotra of Mānatunga, Ed. H. R. Kapadia. Bombay, 1932; Ed and trans. H Jacobi, *Indische Studien*, XIV, pp. 359 ff.

Bhavisyatta-kahā of Dhanapāla, Ed. H. Jacobi. Munchen, 1918; Dalal & Gune, Baroda, 1923.

Bhāvasamgraha of Vāmadeva. MDJG, Bombay

Brhat-kathākośa of Harisena, Ed. A. N. Upadhye. Bombay, 1943.

Darśanasāra of Devasena. MDJG, Bombay.

Daśabhaktyādi-samgraha of Pūjyapāda. MS.

Dasaveyāliya-sutta and *Nijjutti*, Ed. E. Leumann. Leipzig, 1892.

Dhavala of Vīrasena. MS. in CJOL, Arrah.

Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra, Ed. A. N. Upadhye. SJS, Bombay, 1944.

Dvisandhāna-kāvya of Dhanañjaya, Ed. Sivadutt and Parab. Bombay, 1895.

Ganitasāra-saṁgraha of Mahāvīrācārya. MS. in CJOL, Arrah; Ed. M. Rangacharya. Madras, 1912.

Harivaṁśa-purāṇa of Jinasena Sūri. MDJG, Bombay, 1930.

Jainendra Vyākaraṇa of Pūjyapāda Devanandi. MS. in CJOL, Arrah.

Jambu-carita of Vīra. MS. in Jaina Bhandāra, Amer.

Kalpasūtra (*Bṛhat*), Ed. W. S. Schubring. Leipzig, 1905; Ed. H. Jacobi. Leipzig, 1879; Trans. *SBE*, Oxford, 1892.

Kalyānakāraka of Ugrāditya. S. N. Series No 129, Solapur.

Karnāṭaka Śabdānuśāsana, Ed L. Rice, Ed. R. Narsimhachar.

Kasāya-pāhuḍa (*Jayadhavala*) of Vīrasena and Jinasena, Vols. I & II. Mathura, 1944.

Kathākośa of Brahma Nemidatta. Bombay.

Kathākośa (*The Treasury of Stories*), Trans C. H. Tawney with notes by E. Leumann. Leipzig, 1895.

Kavirājamārga of Nrpatunga, Ed K. B. Pathak. Bombay.

Kālakācārya-Kathānaka-saṁgraha SJG, Bombay.

Kārttikeyānuprekṣā-ṭīkā MS in Nayāmandira Bhandāra, Delhi.

Laghu-arhannīti of Hemacandra. Ahmedabad, 1906.

Lokavibhāga, Palm-leaf MS. in CJOL, Arrah.

Mahābandha (*Mahādhavala*). Benares, 1947

Mahāniśītha-sutta, Ed. W. Schubring Berlin, 1918.

Mahāpurāna (*Ādipurāna & Uttarapurāna*) of Jinasena and Guṇabhadra. Indore, V.E 1975-75

Nāmamālā of Dhanañjaya, Ed. S N. Tripathi. Benares, 1950.

Niryāvalias, Ed. S. Warren. Amsterdam, 1879; Ahmedabad, 1922.

Nītivākyāmrta of Somadeva. MDJG, Bombay, 1887-88.

Nyāyakumudacandra of Prabhācandra, Vols. I & II. MDJG, Bombay, 1938.

Nyāyāvatāra of Siddhasena, Ed. S C. Vidyabhushana. Calcutta, 1904.

Padmapurāna of Raviscna. MDJG, Bombay, 1928-29.

Pancāstikāya of Kundakunda, Ed. A. C. Chakravarty. *SBJ*, Allahabad, 1920.

Paramappayāsu of Joindu, Ed. A. N. Upadhye. Bombay, 1937.
Pariśiṣṭa-parvan (*Sthavirāvali-carita*) of Hemacandra, Ed. H. Jacobi, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 2nd ed. 1932.
Paṭṭāvalis (of the Digambara sect) in MSS. in CJOL, Arrah, and in Jaina Bhaṇḍāras at Delhi and Amer.
Pattāvalī-samuccaya, 2 Vols., Ed. Darśanavijaya. Viramgam, 1933.
Pārśvābhyudaya of Jinasena, Ed. K. B. Pathak (with Mallinātha's commentary). Poona, 1894; Bombay, 1909.
Paum-cariu (*Rāmāyaṇa*) of Vimala Sūri, Ed. H. Jacobi. Bhavnagar, 1914.
Prabandha-cintāmani of Merutuṅga, Ed. Jinavijaya. SJS, 1933.
Prabandha-kośa of Rājaśekhara, Ed. Jinavijaya. SJS, 1935.
Prabhāvaka-carita of Prabhācandra, Ed. Jinavijaya. SJS, 1940.
Pramāna-saṃgraha of Akalanka. MS.
Praśnottara-ratnamālā of Nrpatunga, Ed. K. B. Pathak. Bombay.
Pravacanasāra of Kundakunda, Ed A. N. Upadhye. Bombay, 1935, Ed. F. W. Thomas & B. Faddegan Cambridge, 1935.

Ratnakaranda Śrāvakācāra of Samantabhadra, Ed. J K. Mukhtar, MDJG, Bombay, 1928.
Rājāvalis, MSS. in Jaina Bhandāras at Delhi.
Rājāvalī-kathe of Devacandra, A Compendium of Jaina History (cf, Fleet, *IA*, 1892, pp. 157 ff.).

Śabdānuśāsana of Śākatāyana. Bombay, 1907.
Śrutāvatāra of Bibudha Sridhara. MDJG, Bombay, 1922.
Śrutāvatāra of Indranandi. MDJG, Bombay, 1918.

Ṣatakhandāgama (*Dhavala*). 10 Vols., Ed. H. L. Jain. Amraoti.
Ṣaṭprābhṛtādi-saṃgraha of Kundakunda. MDJG, Bombay.
Ṣaddarśana-samuccaya of Haribhadra. Calcutta, 1915.

Samācāri-śataka of Samaya Sundara.
Samarāicca-kahā of Haribhadra, Ed. H Jacobi Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1926.
Samayasāra of Kundakunda, Ed. Gajadhar Lal. Benares, 1914.
Sanmati-tarka of Siddhasena, Ed. Sukhlal, Trans Athavale & Gopani. Bombay, 1939.
Sarvārthasiddhi of Devanandi Pūjyapāda. Meerut.
Siddhahema-śabdānuśāsana of Hemacandra. Benares, 1905.
Sūyagadānga, Eng. trans. H. Jacobi. Oxford, 1895.

Svayambhu-chandas of Svayambhu, Ed. H. D. Velankar, *JBBRAS*, 1935; *JUB*, Nov. 1936.

Tattvārtha-rājavārttika of Akalanka, Ed. M K. Nyayacarya.
Tattvārtha-ślokavārttika of Vidyānandi. MS. Saharanpur.
Tattvārtha-sūtra of Umāsvāmin, Ed. Sukhlal. Benares, 1952, Ed. K. C Sastri. Mathura.
Tiloyapannati of Yativṛṣabha, MS in CJOL, Arrah, Ed. A. N. Upadhye & H. L. Jain Solapur, 1951.
Trilokasāra of Nemicandra. MDJG, Bombay

Upamiti-bhava-prapañca-kathā of Siddharsi, Ed Peterson & Jacobi. Calcutta, 1899.
Uttarādhyayana, Ed. J. Charpentier. Uppasala, 1922, Eng. trans. H. Jacobi. *SBE*, Oxford, 1895.
Uttarapurāna of Gunabhadra. Benares, 1952.
Uvaesamālā of Dharmadāsa, Ed. L. P. Tessitori, 1912
Uvāsagadasāo, Ed. & Eng. trans A F. R. Hoernle Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1885-88.

Varāṅga-carita of Jaṭāsimhanandi, Ed. A. N. Upadhye Bombay, 1933; Ed. K. C Gorawala Mathura, 1953
Vardhamāna-carita of Asaga. Solapur, 1931.
Vasudevahindi of Dharmadāsa Bhavnagar, 1930
Vasunandi Śrāvakācāra of Vasunandi Benares, 1952.
Vavahāra, Ed. W. Schubring. Leipzig, 1918.
Vāākā, MS. in Jaina Temple, Kanpur.
Vijayodayā-tīkā of Aparājitasūri, Ed. N. R. Premi. Bombay, 1933.
Vividha-Tīrtha-kalpa of Jinaprabha, Ed. Jinavijaya. Bombay.
Yasastilaka-campū of Somadeva, Ed. Sivadutt & Parab Bombay, 1901-03.

B. General Books on History and Culture :

Aiyengar, M. Srinivasa, *Tamil Studies*. Madras, 1914.
Aiyengar, S.K., *Ancient India*.
—do.—, *Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture*. Calcutta, 1923.
Allan & Dodwell, *Cambridge Shorter History of India*.
Alsdorf, A., *Apabhramsa Studien*. Leipzig, 1937
—do.—, *Harivamsa Purana* (edited). Hamburg, 1936.
Altekar, A.S., *Education in Ancient India* (5th ed.). Varanasi, 1957.

Altekar, A. S., *The Rastrakutas and Their Times.* Poona, 1934.

Ayangar, P.T. Srinivasa, *History of the Tamils.*

Ayyangar, M.S. Ramaswami, & Rao, B. Sheshagiri, *Studies in South Indian Jainism.* Madras, 1922.

Bajpai, K.D., *Bharatiya Vyāpāra kā Itihāsa.* Mathura, 1951.

—do.—, *Braja ka Itihāsa*, 2 Vols., Mathura.

Barodia, U.D., *History and Literature of Jainism.* Bombay, 1909.

Barth, A., *The Religions of India* (Eng trans by J. Wood). London, 1882.

Barua, B.M., *Old Brahmi Inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khandagiri Caves.* Calcutta, 1929.

Basham, A.L., *The Wonder that was India* London, 1954.

Belvalkar, S K, *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar* Poona, 1915.

Bhandarkar, D.R, *Jaina Iconography.* *IA*, xl, pp 125 ff., 153 ff.

Bhandarkar, R G, *Collected Works.* Vols. I IV Poona, 1927-33.

—do.—, *Early History of the Deccan.* Calcutta, 1926.

—do—, *Report on Sanskrit Manuscripts* 1883-84

Bhattacharya, B.C., *Jaina Iconography.* Lahore, 1939.

Bool Chanda, *Lord Mahavira* Benares, 1948

Brown, Percy, *Indian Architecture*

—do.—, *Indian Painting.* Calcutta, 1930

Brown, W Norman, *Story of Kalaka* Washington, 1933

Buchanan, *Travels*

Buhler, J.G, *Uber die indische Secte der Jainas* Vienna, 1887 (Eng. trans.. *The Indian Sect of the Jains* by J Burgess London, 1903).

Burgess, J., *Ancient Monuments, Temples and Sculptures of India,* 2 Vols. London, 1897

—do.—, *Cave Temples of India.* London, 1880.

—do.—, *Jaina Iconography.*

Cambridge History of India, Vol I. Cambridge, 1935.

Chakravarti, A C., *Jaina Literature in Tamil.* Arrah, 1941.

Charpentier, J., *The History of the Jainas* (*CHI*, I, pp. 150-70).

Chatterji, B R., *Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia.* Calcutta, 1928.

Colebrooke, H.T., *Miscellaneous Essays.* Madras, 1871.

Coomaraswamy, A.K., *History of Indian and Indonesian Art.* London, 1927.

Cultural Heritage of India. Ramakrishna Mission Institute, Calcutta, 1937, 53.

Cunningham, A., *Ancient Geography of India*. Calcutta, 1924.

Das Gupta, *The Jaina System of Education*. Calcutta.

Desai, M.D., *Jaina Gurjara Kavio*, 3 Vols. Bombay, 1926-44.

—do.—, *Jaina Sāhitya no Sankshipta Itihāsa*. Bombay, 1933.

Dey, N.L., *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*.

Dhruva, A.B., *Introduction to Prakrita*.

Dixitar, V.R. Ramchandra, *Studies in Tamil Literature and History*. 2nd ed., Madras, 1936.

Dubreuil, G.J., *Ancient History of the Deccan*. Pondicherry, 1920.

—do.—, *Pallava Painting* (*IA*, 1923; Pudukottai, 1920).

Duff, C.M., *Chronology of India*. Westminster, 1899.

Dutta, Sukumara, *Early Buddhist Monachism*. London, 1924.

Fergusson, J., *A History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*. Revised ed., London, 1910.

Fleet, J.F., *Dynasties of Kanarese Districts* (*Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. 2).

Fuhrer, A., *Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions*. Allahabad, 1891.

—do.—, *Museum Report*, 1890-91.

Ghoshal, U.N., *Ancient Indian Culture in Afghanistan*. Calcutta, 1927.

Glasenapp, H., *Der Jainismus*. Berlin, 1926.

Guerinot, A., *Essai de Bibliographie Jaina*. Paris, 1906.

—do.—, *La religion Djaina*. Paris, 1926.

—do.—, *Notes de Bibliographie Jaina* (*Journal Asiatique*, Paris, XIV, pp. 48-148).

—do.—, *Repertoire d' Epigraphie Jaina*. Paris, 1908.

Havell, E.B., *Ancient and Mediaeval Architecture of India*. London, 1915.

Hayavadana Rao, *Mysore Gazetteer*, Vol. II.

Hertel, J., *On the Literature of the Svetambaras of Gujarat*.

—do.—, *Panchatantra*.

Hinduqui, K.K., *Yaśastilaka Champu and Indian Culture*. Solapur, 1949.

Hiralal, *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in C.P. and Berar.*
Hopkins, E.W., *The Religions of India.* Boston, 1895.
Hyderabad—A Guide to Art and Architecture. 1951.

Jagan Nath, *Jainism in the Gupta Age (Jaina Vidya,* I. 1).
Jain, Hira Lal, *Jaina Śilālekha Samgraha,* Pt. I. Bombay, 1927.
Jain, J.C., *Bhārata ke Prācīna Jaina Tīrtha.* Benares, 1950.
Jain, Jyoti Prasad, *Hastināpura.* U.P. Government, Lucknow, 1955.
—do.—, *Jainism.* Benares, 1950.
—do.—, *Prakāśita Jaina Sāhitya.* Delhi, 1958.
Jain, Kamta Prasad, *Bhagawan Mahavira.* Delhi, 1951.
Jaini, J L., *Outlines of Jainism.* Ed. F.W. Thomas. Cambridge, 1916.
Jayaswal, K.P , *Dynasties of Kali Age.*
—do.—, *Hindu Polity.* 2nd ed. 1943
—do.—, *History of India* 150-350 A.D. Lahore, 1933.

Kalyanavijaya, *Vīra Nirvāṇa Samvat aur Jaina Kāla Gaṇanā.* Jalor, 1930.
Kapadia, H.R., *History of the Canonical Literature of the Jains.* Bombay, 1941
—do.—, *Jain Religion and Literature,* Vol. I, Pt. 1. Lahore, 1944.
Keith, A B., *A History of Sanskrit Literature.*
Kramrisch, Stella, *Indian Sculpture.* London, 1933.
Krishna Rao, B.V., *History of the Early Dynasties of Andhra Pradesh* Madras, 1942.
—do.—, *Jainism in Andhradesh (Journ. Andhra Hist. Soc.,* XII).

Law, B.C., *India as depicted in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism.* London, 1941.
—do.—, *Jaina Canonical Sutras.*
—do.—, *Mahavira—His Life and Teachings.* London, 1937.
Longhurst, A.H., *Hampi Ruins.* Madras, 1917.

Macdonell, A.A., *A History of Sanskrit Literature.*
Marshall, J., *Indian Coins.*

Max Muller, *India, What can it teach Us?* London, 1883.

M'Crindle, J.W., *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian.* Calcutta, 1926.

Mehta, N.C., *Indian Painting.*

Modi, M.C., *Apabhraṃśa Pāṭhāvali.*

Moraes, G.M., *The Kadamba Kula* Bombay, 1931.

Mukhtar, J.K., *Bhagwān Mahāvīra aur unkā Samaya.* Delhi, 1934.

—do.—, *Purātana Jaina Vākya Sūcī* Sarsawa, 1950.

—do.—, *Svāmi Samantabhadra* Bombay, 1928.

Nahar, P.C., *Jaina Lekha Saṃgraha*, 3 Vols Calcutta, 1918-29.

Narsimhachar, R., *Epigraphia Carnatica*, II, Introduction.

—do.—, *Inscriptions at Sravana Belgola* Bangalore, 1923.

—do.—, *Karnataka Kavicarite.* Madras, 1940.

Nawab, S.B., *Jain Citra Kalpadruma.* Ahmedabad, 1935.

Ojha, G.H., *Rājputāne kā Itihāsa*

Oppert, Gustav, *On the Original Inhabitants of Bharatvarsa* Westminster, 1893

Pargiter, F.E., *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition.* London, 1922.

Peterson, *Report on Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 1883-84.

Pillai, K.N. Sivaraj, *The Chronology of the Early Tamils.* Madras, 1932.

Pillai, S.K., *Indian Ephemeris.*

Premi, N.R., *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa* Bombay, 1942, rev. ed., 1956.

Rajendrasuri, *Adhidhāna Rājendra.*

Rangacharya, V., *Topographical List of Madras Presidency.* Madras, 1919.

Rao, M.V. Krishna, *The Gangas of Talkad* Madras, 1936.

Rapson, E., *Ancient India.* Cambridge, 1916.

Raychaudhuri, H.C., *Political History of Ancient India.* Calcutta, 1953.

Raychaudhuri, Dutta and Majumdar, *An Advanced History of India*, Pt. I. London, 1948.

Rice, B.L., *Coorg Inscriptions.*

—do.—, *Inscriptions at Sravana Belgola.* Bangalore, 1899.

Rice, E.P., *History of Canarese Literature.* London, 1921.

Rice, Lewis, *Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions*. Rev. ed., London, 1909.

Sachau, E.C., *Alberuni's India*, Vols. I & II London, 1914.

Saletore, B.A., *Ancient Karnataka*, Vol. I. Poona, 1936.

—do—, *Mediaeval Jainism*. Bombay, 1938.

Sankalia, H.D., *Jain Iconography*

Sankrityayana, Rahul, *Buddhacaryā*.

—do.—, *Hindī Kāvyadhārā*. Allahabad, 1945.

—do.—, *Tattvasaṃgraha* (edited).

Sarkar, B.K., *Creative India from Mohenjodaro, etc.* Lahore, 1937.

Sastri, K.A N., *History of India*, Pt. I. Madras, 1950.

—do.—, *A Comprehensive History of India*, Pt. II. (edited).

Sastri, K.B , *Praśasti Saṃgraha*. Arrah, 1942.

Sastri, Srikantha, *Sources of the History of Karnataka*, Vol. I.

Satyasrava, *Sakas in India* Lahore, 1942.

Schubring, W., *Die Lehre der Jainas*. Leipzig, 1935

—do.—, *Die Jainas* Tulingen, 1927.

—do.—, *Worte Mahaviras*. Gottingen, 1926.

Schoff, W.H , *The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea* (Eng. Trans.). London, 1912.

Sen, A.C., *Schools and Sects in Jaina Literature*. Calcutta, 1931.

Sewell, Robert, *A Sketch of the Dynasties of South India*. Madras, 1883.

Shah, C.J., *Jainism in Northern India*. Bombay, 1932

Shah, U.P. *Studies in Jaina Art*. Varanasi.

Sharma, S.R., *Jainism and Karnataka Culture*. Dharwar, 1940.

Sircar, D C., *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, Vol. I. Calcutta, 1942.

—do.—, *Successors of the Satavahanas in Lower Deccan*. Calcutta, 1939.

Smith, V.A., *Early History of India* (3rd ed.). Oxford, 1914.

—do.—,*History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* (2nd ed). Oxford, 1930.

—do —, *Jaina Stupa and Other Antiquities of Mathura*. Allahabad, 1901.

—do.—, *Oxford History of India*. Oxford, 1920.

Srinivasachari, and Ayengar, Ramaswamy, *History of India*.

Stevenson, S. (Mrs.), *The Heart of Jainism*. Oxford, 1915

Sturrock, *South Canara*.

Tarn, W.W., *Greeks in Bactria and India.* Cambridge, 1939.
The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vols. I-V. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
Thomas, E., *The Early Faith of Asoka-Jainism.* London, 1877.
Tripathi, R.S., *History of Ancient India.*

Vaidya, C.L., *History of Mediaeval Hindu India* (Rev. ed.). Poona, 1942.
Velankar, H.D., *Jina-ratna-koṣa.* Poona, 1944.
Vidyabhushana, S.C., *A History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic.* Calcutta, 1920.
Vijayendra Suri, *Vaiśālī.* Delhi, 1946.
—do.—, *Vīra Vihāra Mīmāṃsā.* Delhi, 1946.
Vogel, J. Ph., *Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at Mathura.* Allahabad, 1910.

Watters, Thomas, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India.* London, 1904-05.
Weber, *History of Indian Literature.* London, 1882.
—do—, *Sacred Literature of the Jains.*
Wilson, *Mackenzie Collections* (Edited).
Winternitz, *An Outline of Jaina Literature.*
—do.—, *History of Indian Literature,* Pt. II.
—do.—, *Jains in the History of Indian Literature.* Ahmedabad, 1946.

C. General Reference Volumes, Reports, Journals, Etc. :

Acta Orientalia, Oslo, Norway, 1924.
Anekānta, Hindi monthly, Sarsawa, Delhi.
Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
Archaeological Survey of India Reports
Asiatique Researches.

B.C. Law Volume, Pt. I & II, Calcutta, 1945; Poona, 1946.
Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume.
Bhāratīya Vidyā, Bombay.
Bibliotheca Indica, 1903-05.
Bombay Gazetteer.

Calcutta Review.

Catalogue—Government Library, Poona.
Catalogue of Jaselmere Bhandar, Baroda, 1923.
Candābāi Volume, Arrah.
Classified Catalogue of Tamil Printed Books.
Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vols. II & III.

D.R. Bhandarkar Volume.
Divākara Volume.
Dwivedī Volume, Benares.

Encyclopaedia of Ethics and Religion, Vol. VII.
Epigraphia Carnatica.
Epigraphia Indica.

Hindi Viśvakośa.

Imperial Gazetteer of India.
Indian Antiquary, Poona.
Indian Culture, Calcutta.
Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
Inscriptions of Northern India.

Jain Gazette, English Monthly, Lucknow.
Jaina Antiquary, Arrah.
Jaina Gazette, Hindi weekly, Delhi.
Jaina Granthāvali.
Jaina Hitaiśī, Hindi monthly, Bombay.
Jaina Jagata, Hindi fortnightly, Bombay.
Jaina Sandeś—Śodhāṅka, Hindi quarterly, Mathura.
Jaina Sāhitya Saṁśodhaka, Poona.
Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara, Hindi six-monthly, Arrah.
Journal of Indian History.
Journal of the Baroda University.
Journal of the Bengal Royal Asiatic Society.
Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.
Journal of the Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society.
Journal of the Bombay University.
Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University.
Journal of the Kalinga Historical Research Society.
Journal of the Nagpur University.

Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda.
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Journal of the U. P. Historical Society, Lucknow.

Karnataka Historical Review.

Madras Epigraphical Report.
Modern Review, Calcutta.
Mysore Archaeological Report.

Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Patrikā, Kasi.

Orissa Historical Research Journal.

Prabuddha Bhārata.
Premī Volume, Tikamgarh, 1946.
Proceedings of the Sessions of the All India Oriental Conference.
Proceedings of the Sessions of the Indian History Congress.

Report on Archaeological Survey of Western India.

Travancore Manual.

Varṇī Volume, Sagar, 1949.
Vikrama Volume, Ujjain, 1948.

INDEX

K

W

Y